

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. XII

NOVEMBER, 1946

No. 4



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XII

NOVEMBER, 1946

NUMBER 4

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

BOARD OF EDITORS

WESLEY F. CRAVEN
New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE
University of Texas

THOMAS D. CLARK
University of Kentucky

WILLIAM B. HAMILTON
Duke University

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON
Tulane University

BERNARD MAYO
University of Virginia

KATHRYN ABBEY HANNA
Rollins College

HENRY T. SHANKS
Birmingham-Southern College

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

HENRY L. SWINT, Vanderbilt University

GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership application and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME XII

NOVEMBER, 1946

NUMBER 4



Copyright, 1946, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>An Analysis of Some Reconstruction Attitudes.</i> By T. Harry Williams . . .	469
<i>The Question of Slavery and the Free Negro in the Tennessee Constitutional Convention of 1834.</i> By Chase C. Mooney	487
<i>The Virginia Central Railroad at War, 1861-1865.</i> By Charles W. Turner . . .	510
<i>The Problem of Credit Rating in the Ante-Bellum South.</i> By Lewis E. Atherton	534

Notes and Documents

Some Personal Letters of Robert E. Lee, 1850-1857. Edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr.	557
A Note on James Stuart, Loyalist Clergyman in South Carolina. Edited by Henry D. Bull	570

Book Reviews

Morris, <i>Government and Labor in Early America</i> , by John E. Pomfret	576
Klingberg, <i>Carolina Chronicle: The Papers of Commissary Gideon Johnston, 1707-1716</i> , by Philip Davidson	577
Hall, <i>Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, Volume V</i> , by William D. Hoyt, Jr.	579
Wright, <i>Our Georgia-Florida Frontier: The Okefinokee Swamp, Its History and Cartography</i> , by Dorothy Dodd	581
Dumbauld, <i>Thomas Jefferson, American Tourist</i> , by Elizabeth Cometti	582
McKinley and Bent, <i>Old Rough and Ready: The Life and Times of Zachary Taylor</i> , by William O. Lynch	584
Rister, <i>Robert E. Lee in Texas</i> , by Ottis Clark Skipper	585
Hoole, <i>The Ante-Bellum Charleston Theatre</i> , by Charles E. Cauthen	586
Harmon, <i>The Famous Case of Myra Clark Gaines</i> , by James W. Silver	588
McCarty, <i>Maverick Town: The Story of Old Tascosa</i> , by Llerena Friend	590
Destler, <i>American Radicalism, 1865-1901: Essays and Documents</i> , by H. C. Nixon	591
Curti, <i>The Roots of American Loyalty</i> , by Harold W. Bradley	592

Historical News and Notices

Personal	594
Historical Societies	598
Bibliographical	600

<i>Contributors</i>	608
-------------------------------	-----

An Analysis of Some Reconstruction Attitudes

BY T. HARRY WILLIAMS

In late years revisionist historians have done much to correct the existing and often distorted picture of the Reconstruction period in American history. Earlier writers on Reconstruction, whether they were Republican politicians or southern polemicists, journalists, or historians, exhibited a number of historical deficiencies, but in general it may be said that they told a story that was too simple and naïve. It was simple in that the terrible complexities of Reconstruction were presented in the easy terms of stereotypes—the good white Southern Democrats fighting against the bad colored Republicans and their insidious northern allies, or vice versa. It was naïve in that virtually no analysis was made to explain why people acted as they did. Thus carpetbaggers were dishonest because they were bad men or Republicans, but no attempt was made to describe the forces which contributed to their dishonesty. The revisionists have forced several modifications in the Reconstruction story. They have demonstrated, among other things, that the corruption of the Reconstruction state governments has been exaggerated and that in any case corruption was a national, not a purely southern, phenomenon, with an expanding capitalism as the chief corrupting agent; that Democrats were quite as willing as Republicans to be bought by business; that the supposed astronomically high appropriations of the Reconstruction governments seem so only in comparison with the niggardly budgets of the planter-controlled governments of the ante-bellum period; that although the Reconstruction governments were corrupt and dishonest, they must be credited with definite progress in the fields of popular education and internal

improvements; and that the national reconstruction program was radical only in a superficial sense in that it gave political power to the Negro but failed to provide economic power through the promised confiscation and ownership of land, and thus that because the position of the Negro had no lasting basis his rule was easily overthrown.¹

These new viewpoints have provided a desirable balance and proportion to the traditional historical treatment of Reconstruction. Still debated and in part unexplored in research are the motives of the northern and southern people during this period. Who supported Reconstruction and why; and who opposed it, and why? In analyzing the motivation of Reconstruction, historians have devoted most of their attention to northern political and economic groups and have produced certain conclusions which have been generally accepted. What may be termed the Beale thesis, because it has been most competently developed by Professor Howard K. Beale, offers a sectional-class explanation of Reconstruction. According to this thesis, Reconstruction was a successful attempt by northeastern business, acting through the Republican party, to control the national government for its own economic ends: notably, the protective tariff, the national banks, a "sound" currency. To accomplish its program, the business class had to overthrow from the seats of power the old ruling agrarian class of the South and West. This it did by inaugurating Reconstruction, which made the South Republican, and by selling its policies to the voters wrapped up in such attractive vote-getting packages as northern patriotism or the bloody shirt.² Another student of the period, while accepting the Beale

¹ Francis B. Simkins, "New Viewpoints of Southern Reconstruction," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), V (1939), 49-61; Howard K. Beale, "On Rewriting Reconstruction History," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XLV (1940), 807-27; Horace Mann Bond, "Social and Economic Forces in Alabama Reconstruction," in *Journal of Negro History* (Washington, 1916-), XXIII (1938), 290-348. These writers do two things that so many writers on the subject have not done: they treat Reconstruction as a national development rather than as something happening in an insulated South, and they relate it to southern forces before and after Reconstruction.

² Howard K. Beale, *The Critical Year: A Study of Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (New York, 1930), 1, 8, 115, 143-45; Beale, "On Rewriting Reconstruction History," *loc. cit.*, 813.

thesis, points out that northern business men supported Reconstruction not only because of national issues but also because they thought it would enable them to exploit the South through protected capital investments, and that Republican bosses supported Reconstruction because they believed that if the South could be made Republican they could stay in power.³

The Negro author, W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, conceding the part played by industry in formulating the Reconstruction program, contends that there was in the North a substantial mass opinion of liberal idealism, which he calls "abolition-democracy," that stood for a democratic reconstruction plan, including equal rights for Negroes. This group, he insists, represented in politics by men like Thaddeus Stevens, was equally influential with business in determining the nature of Reconstruction.⁴ The existence of such a body of opinion cannot be disputed. That it was as extensive as Du Bois thinks or that it was animated by as much idealism for the Negro may well be doubted; unfortunately there is no way to document accurately its numbers or influence. One thing is certain. The leaders of abolition-democracy did not succeed in incorporating their ideas into the Republican reconstruction scheme. They demanded universal suffrage, universal amnesty, and confiscation of the land of rich Southerners and its distribution among the freedmen. The Republican politicians, being economic reactionaries, discarded confiscation because they had no interest in bringing about a social revolution, and they rejected universal amnesty because it would have made a Republican South improbable. It would seem that the party bosses, instead of being influenced to any considerable degree by abolition-

³ William B. Hesseltine, "Economic Factors in the Abandonment of Reconstruction," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), XXII (1935), 191-210. See also, Hesseltine, *The South in American History* (New York, 1943), 488-89.

⁴ W. E. Burghardt Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction: An Essay toward a History of the Part which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1880* (New York, 1938), 182, 185-87. Beale, in his article, "On Rewriting Reconstruction History," *loc. cit.*, 818-19, admitted that there were minority elements of democratic idealism in the Republican party and that Stevens and Charles Sumner were representatives of these elements. For the contrary view that Stevens thought solely in terms of power for his class and party, see Richard N. Current, *Old Thad Stevens: A Story of Ambition* (Madison, 1942).

democracy, used it for whatever it was worth to marshal support for a program designed to benefit a plutocratic minority.

An interpretation of northern motivation that differs in part from both Beale and Du Bois has come from Marxist historians and writers.⁵ The Marxian thesis has been elaborately presented by James S. Allen,⁶ who regards Reconstruction as a plan formulated and carried through by big business to enable it to dominate the nation. Up to a point, this is only the Beale thesis dressed up in Marxian jargon. Allen, however, proceeds to advance the claim that the business program was "democratic," because industry, in achieving power, smashed the old, feudal planter class of the South and thus helped prepare the way for the coming of the industrial state which, after business itself was smashed, would evolve into a perfect democracy of the Marxist variety.⁷ In recent years writers of Marxist persuasion have dropped Allen's emphasis on the class struggle, and have presented Reconstruction as a straight-out plan of equalitarian democracy. The new departure has been most strikingly expressed, in fictional form, by Howard Fast, who flatly states that the Reconstruction acts of 1867 were intended "to create a new democracy in the South."⁸ The Marxian thesis in any of these forms has little validity. No amount of historical legerdemain can transform the economic reactionaries of the Republican party into great liberals or make the protective tariff and the gold standard into items of the democratic faith. Furthermore, as will be shown, the Marxists are wrong when they try to develop the corollary that Reconstruction was also a democratic process in the South.⁹

⁵ The term Marxist is here applied to those writers who frankly state that they are interpreting history according to the laws and predictions of Karl Marx and to those who without acknowledging Marx write history that conforms to the Marxian pattern.

⁶ James S. Allen, *Reconstruction: The Battle for Democracy, 1865-1867* (New York, 1937).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 18, 22, 81, 89.

⁸ Howard Fast, *Freedom Road* (New York, 1944), 71.

⁹ It is significant that those Negroes who envisioned Reconstruction as a real social revolution for their people saw little idealism in the Republican party. Thus the *New Orleans Tribune*, a Negro newspaper, said: "The Republican party of the North was not formed upon the true basis of justice and equality, as the history of abolition and slavery plainly shows; and it has only the right to claim credit for having abolished slavery as a political necessity and of having given the ballot to the black men as an arm of defence

The sectional-class thesis of Beale would seem to be the most nearly correct analysis of northern motivation, although Beale did not fully explain how northeastern business persuaded agrarian Republicans from the Middle West to support industrial measures and a reconstruction policy designed to insure the rule of business in the South. It has since been demonstrated that this was done in part by giving the Middle West exceptionally generous appropriations for internal improvements and in effect buying its support;¹⁰ and to this should be added such other inducements as free land, pensions, and railroads, as well as such emotional and psychological appeals as habitual use of the bloody shirt. Du Bois was also undoubtedly correct in contending that idealistic forces played a part in shaping reconstruction policy, and his point is a good, although minor, corrective to the purely economic analysis. But the major fact remains that the men who made Reconstruction were moved by issues of economic and political power far more than by democratic idealism.

While the question of northern motivation has been fairly well established, there has been little attempt to prepare a systematic analysis of southern attitudes toward Reconstruction. Most of the professional historians writing on southern reconstruction have been members of or followers of the so-called Dunning school. They are largely responsible for the familiar stereotypes of Reconstruction. According to their interpretation, Reconstruction was a battle between two extremes: the Democrats, as the group which included the vast majority of the whites, standing for decent government and racial supremacy, versus the Republicans, the Negroes, alien carpetbaggers, and renegade scalawags, standing for dishonest government and alien ideals. These historians wrote literally in terms of white and black. This is not to say that they did not recognize the fact that there were differences between South-

to the loyal white men. Emergency, nay necessity, had more to do with the abolition of slavery and the passage of the Military Bill than had philanthropy and love for the negro." Quoted in *New Orleans Times*, July 4, 1873.

¹⁰ Helen J. and T. Harry Williams, "Wisconsin Republicans and Reconstruction, 1865-1870," in *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (Madison, 1917-), XXIII (1939), 17-39.

erners on such issues as Negro suffrage. But they explained the differences in terms of individual motivation. Thus Southerners who advocated the vote for Negroes were either bad men, or wartime Unionists who hated "rebels," or kindly planters who knew Negroes well and wanted to control their votes in the right direction. Although the Dunning writers sensed an apparent disagreement between the planter-business class and the small farmers on the Negro question, with the planters being willing to accept a position of greater equality for the Negro, they did not explore the difference or try to ascertain whether there were economic and social causes for its existence.¹¹

No such reluctance characterizes Du Bois. He boldly proclaims that Reconstruction was a labor movement, an attempt by the white and black proletariat to control the South, "a vision of democracy across racial lines."¹² A basic error invalidates most of his thesis. There was no white proletariat of any significant numbers; the great mass of the whites were yeoman farmers who thought in terms of racial supremacy instead of class solidarity. Furthermore, he exaggerates the readiness of the former non-slaveholding whites to unite with the Negroes. He himself recognizes that there are factual weaknesses in his theory. He knows that the common whites furnished the power by which the Republican state governments were overthrown; but he explains this disturbing fact by claiming that the planters cut off the developing interracial co-operation of the proletariat by appealing to the prejudices of the poorer whites and organizing them on the color line.¹³ Closely

¹¹ The views of the Dunning school are in William A. Dunning, *Reconstruction: Political and Economic, 1865-1877* (New York, 1907), especially pp. 116-17, 213; Walter L. Fleming, *The Sequel of Appomattox: A Chronicle of the Reunion of the States* (New Haven, 1921), especially pp. 47-48, 50-52, 87-88. These criticisms of Dunning and Fleming are not made in any carping spirit. It is recognized that they and other members of the Dunning school were pioneers in the study of Reconstruction and made important factual contributions to its history. It should also be noted that Fleming was aware that many planters were for Negro suffrage and that most farmers were against it. See his *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama* (New York, 1905), 387-88. But he ascribed the planters' attitude merely to a desire to control the Negro vote in order to maintain their power in the legislature.

¹² Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 346-47, 350.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 130-31. These criticisms of Du Bois do not detract from the fact that his book was a valuable contribution to Reconstruction history. In some respects he got closer to the truth of Reconstruction than any other writer.

paralleling Du Bois' interpretation, and even going beyond it, is that of the Marxists. They, too, present Reconstruction as a biracial movement of the laboring class which was finally destroyed by a counter-revolution of the planters.¹⁴ According to Howard Fast, the Negroes and poor whites joined hands in the Republican party and created "a fine, a just, and a truly democratic civilization," but the reactionary planter class refused to permit this experiment in social democracy and wiped it out with force.¹⁵ That the validity of such assertions is open to serious question can be shown by examining the attitude of the planters and business men in Louisiana toward Reconstruction and the Negro and placing the results in the larger setting of what is known about the general attitudes of the southern whites in other parts of the region.

First of all, despite the opinions of the Marxists, the overwhelming mass of the people—the yeoman farmers, middle class whites, and poor whites—were fiercely opposed to Negro suffrage and to any condition of equality for the Negro. The evidence on this point, while not voluminous because of the general inarticulateness of the common whites, is strong; it is best expressed by the fact that the small-farmer, white-belt areas of the southern states voted heavily against Republicans and Republican measures in election after election.¹⁶ As Horace Mann Bond puts it, the farmers hated equally slavery, planters, and Negroes.¹⁷ The attitude of the common whites of Reconstruction is consonant with the known attitude of the poorest whites, economically,

¹⁴ Allen, *Reconstruction*, 111-15, 126, 183-84, 193. On different pages Allen states that a significant portion of the common whites joined the Republican party and again that practically all of them did. The book as a whole gives the impression that the poorer whites as a class became Republicans.

¹⁵ Fast, *Freedom Road*, 263.

¹⁶ Paul Lewinson, *Race, Class, and Party: A History of Negro Suffrage in the South* (New York, 1932), 23, 37, 52; Roger W. Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers during Slavery and After, 1840-1875* (Baton Rouge, 1939), 230; Hesselstine, *South in American History*, 485; Dunning, *Reconstruction*, 213; Fleming, *Sequel of Appomattox*, 47-48, 50, 87-88; Fleming, *Civil War and Reconstruction in Alabama*, 387-88.

¹⁷ Bond, "Social and Economic Factors in Alabama Reconstruction," *loc. cit.*, 294-95. Bond finds that at the beginning of Reconstruction there was some political co-operation between poor whites and Negroes.

today; that is, racial antipathy toward Negroes is always sharpest when accentuated by economic competition. The teachings of social psychology can be adduced to support the generalization concerning the reaction of the whites. In a caste system based on a fixed status for groups, any attempt by a subordinated element—in this case the Negroes—to achieve a higher status unlooses feelings of tension and fear in the next higher group, which will exert itself, often violently, to keep the subordinated group down.¹⁸

The most powerful group in the South was the planter-business class and its professional allies; its position on Reconstruction was of decisive importance. In the beginning days of Reconstruction, the planters and business men strongly opposed the central proposal of the Radical Republican program—suffrage for the Negro. But they opposed it for economic rather than racial reasons. This fact is crucially important in understanding their reactions. To use modern terms, they feared that the grant of the ballot to the Negro would add to the strength of the liberal or progressive vote. This is not to say that they did not regard the Negro as an inferior being of an entirely separate race. But it is to say that they reacted to a proposal to enfranchise a laboring class as would any propertied minority in any society—they opposed it because they believed it would lead to an attack upon property.¹⁹ A few quotations selected from many statements appearing in conservative New Orleans newspapers which were spokesmen of the planter-business interests will demonstrate the point. Terming universal suffrage a menace to property, the New Orleans *Times* said: "The right to vote should be given to those only who can use it with discretion and sound judgment, and as our electoral privileges are already too wide, it would

¹⁸ Kimball Young, *Social Psychology* (New York, 1944), 262-63, 269.

¹⁹ There was logic in this position. Many of the Negro leaders were exponents of radical agrarianism. Said the New Orleans *Tribune*: "There is no more room in the organization of our society, for an oligarchy of slaveholders, or property holders"; and again, "There is in fact, no true republican government, unless the land, and wealth in general, are distributed among the great mass of the inhabitants." Quoted in Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 458-59. This agrarianism never secured any significant victories because the carpetbaggers, scalawags, and professional Negro politicians, interested mainly in corruption and power, choked it off. See Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana*, 243-44.

be the maddest folly to extend them at once to a class who have always been under control, and who—without the ability to form a correct judgment for themselves—would be left to the tender mercies of party tricksters.” Let the Negro wait until he acquired property before he became a voter.²⁰ In a fuller and more philosophical exposition of its views, the *Times* stated:

Wherever voters greatly outnumber property holders, property will assuredly be unsafe. When voters have property and intelligence, there is some hope that they may “find their interest in the interest of the community” and be anxious to secure a consistent, honest, economical and straight-forward administration. But the selfish interest of the non-property holding voter lies in an altogether different direction. He wishes to secure rich pickings, and, too frequently, soils his fingers by base bribes. Were universal negro suffrage to be added to the white universal suffrage now existing in the South, the security of both life and property would be greatly weakened. . . . With our present too widely extended suffrage it is difficult even now to steer between the rocks of the political Scylla and the whirlpool of its Charybdis, and with universal negro suffrage added, the task would be wholly hopeless.²¹

Becoming frankly specific, the *Times* later declared that “If representative institutions are to be preserved in this country, the control of taxes must be left to those who pay them, and the protection of property to those who own it.”²² The New Orleans *Crescent*, endorsing the proposal of South Carolina’s planter leader, Wade Hampton, to extend the vote to Negroes who had acquired property and an education,²³ asserted: “Southern conservatives ask nothing more on the subject of suffrage than that its distribution shall be determined by the test of character and intelligence. They have asked for nothing more from the time that, by one of the irreversible results of war, the Southern negroes became a part of the free population of the country. It is not their fault if such a test has been rejected in favor of another that

²⁰ New Orleans *Times*, August 13, 1865.

²¹ *Ibid.*, December 24, 1866.

²² *Ibid.*, February 2, 1868. There are similar statements in the issues of November 26, 30, 1866, January 26, 1867.

²³ Hampton, Alexander H. Stephens, Benjamin F. Perry, and other leaders had suggested a limited Negro suffrage based on property and education, thus permitting only those Negroes to vote who were conscious of property rights. Hampton believed the planters could easily control such voters. Lewinson, *Race, Class, and Party*, 37-39; Fleming, *Sequel of Appomattox*, 50-52.

proscribes a large proportion of the highest intelligence on the one hand, and opens all political functions to the maximum of ignorance on the other.”²⁴ Expressing the conservatives’ fear of the economic implications of Negro suffrage, the *Crescent* said: “It seems to be practically absurd and dangerous to commit the decisions of those difficult questions to numbers of extemporized citizens incapable of forming any accurate or rational opinions; and likely to imagine that the right to vote means the right to live without work, and to rob the industrious classes for the benefit of the idle and thriftless.”²⁵ The *Picayune* denounced Negro suffrage because it did not believe that common men of any color should vote; manhood suffrage was “the unlimited suffrage of the ignorant, landless and lawless.”²⁶ “We look upon it [voting] as a duty rather than a right,” said the *Picayune*, “and regret that there is so much of it among the whites.”²⁷ To the *Picayune*, Reconstruction was a process that proscribed “intelligence, probity and property” and elevated propertyless nobodies to power.²⁸

To the testimony of conservative newspapers can be added representative statements of conservative planter-business leaders. In 1867, when Congress was considering the radical reconstruction acts, various southern newspapers asked prominent individuals to give their reactions to the proposed measures. More frank and philosophical than most was J. W. Robb of Mississippi. He warned conservatives that all republics in history had fallen when they had extended the ballot to a laboring class, “an ignorant horde of stupid and besotted men.” “I believe,” he continued, “that from the introduction of negro suffrage, the worst form and spirit of agrarianism will arise to disturb the peace and order of the State, and that it will require our utmost exertions to keep it down, and retain for ourselves political existence and individual security.”²⁹ Francis T. Nicholls, who became governor of Lou-

²⁴ New Orleans *Crescent*, October 23, 1867.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, May 14, 1868.

²⁶ New Orleans *Daily Picayune*, May 10, 1868.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, May 23, 1868.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, May 24, 1868.

²⁹ J. W. Robb, in Jackson *Clarion*, March 19, 1868, quoted in New Orleans *Times*, March 22.

isiana in 1877 when white supremacy supposedly was restored, told a Congressional committee that conservatives were opposed to Reconstruction because it had endangered property interests by placing ignorance in power. Before Reconstruction, he said, there had been a relatively small group of ignorant white voters whom the rich could control, but Reconstruction had made ignorance "the dominating power." He favored a law that in the interest of property would disfranchise the ignorant of both races.³⁰

Congress ignored the opposition to Negro suffrage of the planter-business class, based primarily on economic grounds, and of the common whites, based primarily on racial grounds. In 1867 it passed the reconstruction laws of the Radical Republicans; and Negro suffrage and, in many states, Negro rule became a reality. There followed a period of years, varying in different states, in which the Republican party, led by white carpetbaggers and scalawags and composed predominantly of the Negro masses, controlled the South. The political record of its rule was a compound of blatant corruption and forward social legislation. It was an expensive program. Money was needed to gratify the desires of the white and colored politicians for graft and of the colored masses for social services furnished by the state. The Republicans had to resort to higher and higher taxation, and necessarily they laid the heaviest taxes upon real property. While taxation affected all property holders, large and small, the brunt of it fell upon the large holders. This, as Du Bois points out, is a crucial fact in Reconstruction history—a war-impooverished propertied class was being compelled by the votes of poor men to bear an almost confiscatory tax burden.³¹

Faced with extinction by taxation, the planter-business class reacted again and characteristically in economic rather than racial terms. Negro votes had imposed the tax burden. Negro votes could lift it. If in order to persuade the Negroes to do so it was necessary to grant them political and civil equality or even to let them run the state, well and good.

³⁰ *House Reports*, 43 Cong., 2 Sess., No. 261, Part 3, pp. 646-47.

³¹ Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 590-91.

Get the tax rate down, cried one New Orleans conservative, "even if every office in the State, from Governor to the most insignificant constable, were filled by a negro."³² Urged another: "We must get rid of party hacks and political jobbers, and satisfy the reasonable demands of the negroes. This accomplished, Louisiana will again blossom as the rose. It is our only salvation."³³ A prominent merchant declared: "I am in favor, in case we ever have another election, of giving to the colored people the bulk of the lucrative positions. . . . I am not afraid that they will, in any considerable degree abuse their privileges, and, for ourselves, we want nothing but peaceful government."³⁴ "You want civil equality; you shall have it," a leading business man pledged the Negroes, "if you forsake the Northern adventurer who has plundered poor Louisiana until she is penniless."³⁵ On with political cooperation with Negroes, exclaimed a property holder, "for God's sake if it will give us an honest government; our present lot is insupportable."³⁶ A blunt Natchitoches planter asserted that it was imperative that the whites detach the Negroes from the Republicans: "When the war was over we wouldn't have anything to do with the niggers, and let the Radicals gobble them up. . . . I am in favor of anything to get them. Drop the name of Democracy, I say, and go in for the niggers."³⁷

What practical political action did the planter-business class take during Reconstruction to protect itself from excessive taxation and to foster its economic interests? In local elections in New Orleans, for example, the business men contemplated putting up Negro candidates for Congressional and city offices to compete with white Republicans. On Carondelet Street, the city's great business center, it was planned to nominate a colored foreman of one of the leading cotton presses for Congress. Such a man, asserted the business reporter of the New Or-

³² Letter of Archibald Mitchell, in New Orleans *Picayune*, June 18, 1873.

³³ New Orleans *Times*, May 29, 1873.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, May 30, 1873.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, June 6, 1873.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, June 23, 1873.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, June 9, 1873.

leans *Times*, "Will protect and do more for the South than any white Radical which can be selected to run against him. Carondelet street will go for the gentlemen with the cotton press."³⁸ The business men, this journalist explained, "are taking an unusual interest in being represented in Congress by a representative born in the South. The nearer approach to a real African, black in color, the more confidence will be placed in him."³⁹ Since the records do not show that the Carondelet magnates got their foreman nominated, it is probable that the Democratic leaders in New Orleans refused to take a Negro candidate, or even more probable that the cotton press gentleman, if he had political ambitions and an eye for the future, became a Republican. Regardless of the outcome, however, the episode demonstrated that these hard-headed business men placed their economic interests above racial differences and that they preferred to entrust those interests to an understanding and amenable Negro rather than to an untried white.

A second device adopted by the conservatives was to enter the Republican party and seek to control it. A recent study by David H. Donald illustrates how this was done in Mississippi.⁴⁰ After Radical Reconstruction went into effect most of the former Whigs, in antebellum times the party of the big slaveholders, became Republicans. "Such action is not hard to understand," writes Donald. "The Whigs were wealthy men—the large planters and the railroad and industrial promoters—who naturally turned to the party which in the state as in the nation was dominated by business interests."⁴¹ At first these planters, or scalawags, to use a familiar term, dominated the party, but they lost their leadership to the carpetbaggers who, in the struggles for power within the party, were willing to promise more to the Negroes. Donald points to the planters' fruitless opposition to the Republican program of big budgets and high taxes and their revulsion against the

³⁸ *Ibid.*, August 13, 1867. "On 'Change" column. The business columns of the newspapers contain much information about the activities of business men in Reconstruction. Historians have overlooked this important source.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, August 17, 1867. See also issue of September 5.

⁴⁰ David H. Donald, "The Scalawag in Mississippi Reconstruction," in *Journal of Southern History*, X (1944), 447-60.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 449-50.

social equality claimed by the Negroes as sources of their difficulties. Finally, repudiated by people they could not control, they drifted "slowly and reluctantly over to the Democratic camp."⁴²

Still a third device employed by the planters and business men was to invite the Negroes to leave the Republicans and join with them in a new political organization separate from the Democratic party. The conservatives promised in such case to respect the Negro's civil equality and his right to vote and to hold office. Such movements were tried in several states,⁴³ the most elaborate being the so-called "Louisiana Unification Movement."⁴⁴ Inaugurated in 1873, this movement was headed by General Pierre G. T. Beauregard and was supported by the flower of the wealth and culture of New Orleans and South Louisiana.⁴⁵ Its platform advocated complete political equality for the Negro, an equal division of state offices between the races, and a plan whereby Negroes would become landowners. The unifiers denounced discrimination because of color in hiring laborers or in selecting directors of corporations, and called for the abandonment of segregation in public conveyances, public places, railroads, steamboats, and the public schools.⁴⁶ The Louisiana movement, like the others, failed for lack of support from the white masses. The unification program was popular in New Orleans and in the plantation belt of South Louisiana, but in

⁴² *Ibid.*, 453-55.

⁴³ Francis B. Simkins and Robert H. Woody, *South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill, 1932), 447-54; Alrutheus A. Taylor, *The Negro in South Carolina during the Reconstruction* (Washington, 1924), 195-97; John S. Reynolds, *Reconstruction in South Carolina, 1865-1877* (Columbia, 1905), 139-43; James W. Garner, *Reconstruction in Mississippi* (New York, 1901), 238-43.

⁴⁴ T. Harry Williams, "The Louisiana Unification Movement of 1873," in *Journal of Southern History*, XI (1945), 349-69.

⁴⁵ Beauregard believed that in the long run Negro suffrage would increase the political power of the South. The whites could control the Negroes "with a little education and some property qualifications" and "defeat our adversaries with their own weapon." Quoted in *New York Tribune*, April 1, 1867. For other expressions of a similar view, see *ibid.*, April 4, 1867, quoting *Mobile Tribune* and *Wilmington (N. C.) Dispatch*.

⁴⁶ Williams, "Louisiana Unification Movement," *loc. cit.*, 359-61. It is to be noted that rich whites could ask for the destruction of segregation without having to encounter many of the results of non-segregation. This was particularly true in education. As a North Louisiana newspaper pointed out, the rich sent their children to private white schools; the poorer whites had to send theirs to public schools which the rich proposed to make biracial. *Shreveport Times*, quoted in *Monroe Ouachita Telegraph*, June 28, 1873.

the small-farmer areas of other parts of the state it was received with loathing and execration.

It is evident that a basis existed for an alliance of the planter-business class and the Negroes. "If they [the planters] had wished," writes Du Bois, "they could have held the Negro vote in the palm of their hands."⁴⁷ Why did such an alliance fail to materialize? In the first place, the leaders of the unification movements could not persuade any significant number of whites to support the concessions which the planters were willing to accord the colored people. The common whites, animated by racial motives, refused to follow planter leadership, and without any mass white support the unification movements could not succeed. In Louisiana the movement failed to develop much mass support even from the Negroes because professional Negro politicians, secure in their place in the Republican party, advised their followers to shun co-operation and because those Negro leaders who favored co-operation could not suppress their suspicion of the sincerity of the planter-business class. "We know that, by an alliance with you, we can have more privileges than we now enjoy," one Negro spokesman told the conservatives. "We will not then have to cling to the carpet-baggers for protection, but can ourselves take whatever share of office and representation falls to us fairly. Still, we have *some* rights now, and we don't intend to give them up. Rather than do that, we will cling to the carpet-bagger forever, and let him share our power."⁴⁸

In the second place, the planters and business men, while willing to make far-reaching concessions to the Negroes, did not make them because they believed in the principles of racial equality. They made them because of pressing economic reasons and because they wanted to control the Negro vote. They never ceased to regard the Negroes as inferior creatures who by an unfortunate turn of fate had become politically powerful in the state. Hence there was a limit to their concessions, its line marked by anything that seemed to suggest social equality. The carpetbaggers, unhampered by such reservations, could always

⁴⁷ Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 611.

⁴⁸ *New Orleans Times*, May 28, 1873.

outbid the conservatives. Thus in states like Mississippi, where the planter tried to dominate the Republican party, the carpetbaggers took the leadership of the Negroes away from the scalawags. Finally, the differing economic aspirations of the wealthy whites and the Negroes prevented any lasting alliance of the two. The Negroes demanded a program of social services financed by the state, which meant high taxes. The planters wanted to control the colored vote in order to reduce these services and lower taxes which they considered almost confiscatory. The Negroes wanted higher wages and shorter hours; the planters wanted a serf-like system of sharecropping. The planters simply lacked the capital to finance the Negro's social or labor program;⁴⁹ but in view of the obvious conflict between the desires of the two groups it is doubtful whether such a program would have received support from the planters even if they had possessed the necessary means for financing it.

And so the planters and business men, unable to prevent the establishment of Negro suffrage and unable to control it after it was established, joined with the common whites to overthrow the Republican state governments. By 1877 the Democrats controlled every southern state, and what the textbooks call white supremacy was restored. Actually, Negroes continued to vote, although in reduced numbers, and white supremacy was not restored until the 1890's. As Professor C. Vann Woodward has ably demonstrated, the men who came to power after Reconstruction were not in the old agrarian, planter tradition. They were often of the planter class, but in reality they were industrialists or would-be industrialists. They preached the industrialization of the South through the importation of Yankee capital, a policy of low taxes to attract business, and a political alliance with the Northeast instead of with the South's traditional ally, the West.⁵⁰ These men reacted to Negro suffrage as had men of their class during Reconstruc-

⁴⁹ This point is well developed in Du Bois, *Black Reconstruction*, 611-12.

⁵⁰ C. Vann Woodward, *Tom Watson: Agrarian Rebel* (New York, 1938), 58-72. For similar developments in other states, see Francis B. Simkins, *Pitchfork Ben Tillman, South Carolinian* (Baton Rouge, 1944), 79-80; Willie D. Halsell, "The Bourbon Period in Mississippi Politics, 1875-1890," in *Journal of Southern History*, XI (1945), 519-37.

tion. As the vote of labor, it was something to be feared and kept in hand, but as the vote of an inferior people, it was also something that might be manipulated for the benefit of the wealthy. As events developed, the bosses of the New South sometimes found that they could use the colored vote to beat down attempts of the farmers to take over control of the Democratic party. In the election of 1880 in Georgia, for example, the rich defeated the farmers through a combination of a minority of the white votes and a majority of the colored ones.⁵¹ The southern champions of industrialism, therefore, took no action to disfranchise the Negro; they used him to maintain the supremacy of a few white men over other white men. Disfranchisement finally came as a result of the efforts of small-farmer leaders like Ben Tillman.⁵²

Placed in the general setting, therefore, the interests and activities of the Louisiana planter-capitalist group serve to confirm the fact that the Reconstruction period was one of the most complex in American

⁵¹ Woodward, *Tom Watson*, 80-81; Judson C. Ward, "The Republican Party in Bourbon Georgia, 1872-1890," in *Journal of Southern History*, IX (1943), 200. See, also, Simkins, *Pitchfork Ben Tillman*, 164, 167. The planters also employed the Negro vote against the Republicans. In 1884 Edward Gay, Democrat, was running for Congress from a South Louisiana district against Republican William P. Kellogg. Edward N. Pugh, Democratic leader of Ascension Parish, outlined for the sugar planters methods of swinging the colored vote behind Gay. Let owners and managers tell the Negro workers to vote for Gay, he advised: "They naturally receive with deference the expression of opinion by their employers on all subjects. . . . Nearly all the leading colored men are with us and they need only the offer of substantial moral support from the employers to swell the number of the supporters of Mr. Gay from the ranks of the colored employees." Edward N. Pugh to William Porcher Miles, October 30, 1884, in W. P. Miles Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina).

⁵² Although the impetus for disfranchisement generally came from farmer leaders, the rich whites acquiesced in the movement. They did so partly out of a desire to placate the white masses and partly because the farmers, particularly during the agrarian unrest of the 1890's, sometimes tried to vote the Negroes on their side. The competition for the colored vote frightened many whites and forced the wealthy whites to pay out large monetary sums to retain their Negro supporters. Undoubtedly the planter-business class saw in disfranchisement a chance to eliminate a purchasable vote that was steadily becoming more expensive. See George M. Reynolds, *Machine Politics in New Orleans, 1897-1926* (New York, 1936), 21, 26-27, 29-30, 35. "As the situation had developed," writes Reynolds, "it seemed best to take the Negro vote off the market and leave only the white electorate with its comparatively small venal vote to be traded in on election day" (p. 26). For an itemized account of how much it cost the planters in one Louisiana parish to buy Negro votes in the election of 1892, and a complaint about the price, see Henry McCall to William Porcher Miles, May 4, 1892, in Miles Papers.

history. It witnessed the ending of a great civil struggle and the travail of postwar adjustment, the consummation of a momentous economic revolution, and a wrenching change in race relations. No less complex than the times were the motives that impelled people—northern and southern, white and black, rich and poor—to act as they did. No simple or generic explanation cast in the form of sectional stereotypes will supply the key to what happened. Economic, social, and political stimuli affected groups in the South in different ways, and Southerners differed among themselves on the issues of Reconstruction in about the same degree as did groups in the North. The planter-capitalist class of the South thought and acted in terms of economic self-interest in a fashion similar to the industrial magnates of the North. The important difference was that the business men carried the northern people with them while the planters were unable to convince the white masses in the South that economics transcended racial supremacy.

The Question of Slavery and the Free Negro in the Tennessee Constitutional Convention of 1834

BY CHASE C. MOONEY

Though the debates in Virginia in 1831 and 1832 have been the basis for many books and articles and have generally been depicted as representing the turn of the South from a modified dissatisfaction with slavery to an uncompromising defense of the institution, too little attention seems to have been directed to an analysis of later contests between the slavery and antislavery forces in some of the other southern states. One such skirmish took place in the Tennessee constitutional convention of 1834. The date of this event and the nature of the arguments presented by the defenders and opponents of slavery bring into focus the question of the validity of some of the assertions and implications that have been made concerning the attitudes prevailing in the South after 1831.

When the constitutional convention assembled at Nashville in the spring of 1834, there was little indication that slavery or the free Negro would become the center of an extended and frequently bitter controversy before it adjourned. By 1831, the antislavery movement, which had been relatively conservative but quite strong in East Tennessee, had practically run its course and the more outspoken and aggressive members of the Tennessee societies had moved to the Northwest. The Western District had been opened for settlement more than a decade earlier and the center of population had shifted toward the western part of the state, where there was more plantation life and slavery was more profitable. Coupled with these factors, the Tennesseans feared

and resented the forces portrayed by Nat Turner's insurrection and Garrison's *Liberator*, and after the early 1830's any plan of freeing the slaves in Tennessee was, rightly or wrongly, generally linked with the uncompromising opposition of the northern abolitionists.¹ "There seems to have been," says one writer, "a uniform impression among the great majority of the citizens of the state that the abolition movement was wrong as it stood related to the political fabric and that it had in it the germ of incalculable injury."²

Most of the newspapers merely carried notices of the forthcoming election for convention delegates, and though the *National Banner and Nashville Daily Advertiser* cautioned the voters on the need for exercising care in the selection of the delegates, urged the adoption of a graduated land tax, and discussed other important issues, nothing was said that advocated any change in the status of the slave or the provisions of the suffrage.³ Some of the candidates thought that the slavery question would "probably" be agitated, but so far as has been discovered only one, Return J. Meigs, expressed himself in favor of constitutional provision for a system of emancipation;⁴ and he was among those defeated.

In spite of the rapid decrease in antislavery sentiment in the state during the seven years preceding the convention, it might have been expected that some of the delegates from the eastern section would force the issue on the convention. While many people of that area would either defend slavery or remain passive if the institution were attacked by a northern abolitionist, they would not, and did not, hesitate to enter the fray in behalf of the Negro so long as their opponents

¹ For some phases of the antislavery movement in Tennessee, see Asa E. Martin, "The Anti-Slavery Societies of Tennessee," in *Tennessee Historical Magazine* (Nashville, 1915-1937), I (1915), 261-80; James W. Patton, "Progress of Emancipation in Tennessee," in *Journal of Negro History* (Washington, 1916-), XVII (1932), 67-102; and Chase C. Mooney, "Slavery in Tennessee" (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1939), 120-36.

² Martin, "Anti-Slavery Societies of Tennessee," *loc. cit.*, 273-74.

³ See the issues published in August and September, 1833.

⁴ See *National Banner and Nashville Daily Advertiser*, February 14 and 17, 1834; *Athens Tennessee Journal*, January 18, 1834. The *Journal* carried the subtitle, "The Herald of a Noisy World."

were fellow Tennesseans. Previous attempts to end slavery had proved futile, or practically so, and opponents of the institution seem to have girded themselves for a supreme effort to persuade the convention to approve the eventual extinction of slavery. Their tactics involved the use of the familiar petition.

The convention assembled at Nashville on May 19, 1834, with former Governor Willie Blount as temporary chairman. The sixty members proceeded with the minutiae of convention organization, chose William B. Carter of Carter County as permanent chairman, and by June 6 had listened to, and voted to table, thirty memorials on the subject of the eventual abolition of slavery in the state.⁵ All but one of these petitions proposed a definite plan for ridding the state of slavery, but none sought immediate abolition. One proposal was that all children born after 1835 be free; others sought to have all slaves freed in 1855 with the understanding that they should be removed from the state; the remainder wished to bring about freedom after 1866 and possibly to colonize the freedmen. There were no memorials from forty-six of the sixty-two counties of the state; none came from West Tennessee, and only five originated in Middle Tennessee counties. Only 1,804 of the estimated 550,000 white population had signed the memorials, and 651, or more than one-third, of the signatories were from Washington and Greene counties, in East Tennessee. The 105 slaveowners who had signed did not have a total of more than 500 slaves and "probably not half that number," while some individuals "appeared to sign" from more than one county.⁶

The delegates did not wish to consider these documents in the committee of the whole, and on May 21 they adopted a motion re-

⁵ Two other memorials were later presented, one of which was referred to a special committee, and the other was read and tabled after the controversy had subsided.

⁶ *Journal of the Constitutional Convention of 1834* (Nashville, 1834), 125-30. No evidence was found to support the statement of Elihu E. Hoss, "Elihu Embree, Abolitionist," in *American Historical Magazine* (Nashville, 1896-1904), II (1897), 136, that the convention was "flooded" with petitions from "all parts of the state, and especially from East Tennessee, praying for immediate emancipation. Nearly one third of the members of that body voted in favor of the action requested." No opportunity to vote directly on such an issue was ever afforded the convention members.

ferring them to a committee of propositions and grievances.⁷ The reference of the memorials and the creation of this special committee were of little immediate significance. It was the report of another special committee, charged with drafting the reasons for not considering the memorials in the committee of the whole, that became the springboard of controversy.

Several motions providing for a committee of broader powers were entertained before the reason-drafting committee was formed. Notable among these were the suggestions of Willie Blount and of Matthew Stephenson (Washington County). On May 24 Blount proposed a committee of twenty-six (two from each district) to report, among other things, on the franchise and "suitable provisions in relation to slavery and emancipation, in such a manner as to put those subjects at rest, never to be interfered with by the Legislature in any circumstances." Six days later Stephenson unsuccessfully sought the approval of a committee of thirteen members to be instructed to consider the propriety of "designating some period from which slavery shall not be tolerated in the state."⁸

On the previous day, May 29, John A. McKinney (Hawkins County) had called attention to the fact that he was able to approach the subject of slavery rather impartially since his great interest in the topic was not motivated by economic factors and since there would probably be no memorials from his county before the assemblage.⁹ Apparently at McKinney's suggestion, Robert Allen (Smith County) moved on June 6 that a committee of three, one from each of the main divisions of the state, be appointed to draft the reasons that governed the convention in declining to act on the slavery memorials in the committee of

⁷ *Journal of the Convention*, 15.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 28, 30, 53.

⁹ *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, May 31, 1834. Many of the remarks of the delegates were not entered into the *Journal* and must, therefore, be drawn from other sources. McKinney, a Whig in 1834 and a Bell elector in 1860, was born in Ireland and came to Tennessee in 1805 via Pennsylvania. His nephew, Robert J. McKinney, delegate from Greene County and future justice of the Tennessee Supreme Court, was also a native of Ireland and a Whig. The younger McKinney wanted a system of abolition inaugurated. His role in the convention was a minor one. If no initials are used below, John A. McKinney is meant.

the whole.¹⁰ The motion evoked considerable comment before it was approved.

In speaking for this motion, McKinney emphasized the fact that the convention of 1796 had not in any way interfered with slavery, and that it was not necessary for the present convention to do so. He feared that the fixing of a terminal date for slavery in Tennessee would cause the slaves to be driven from their "comfortable homes, religious privileges and schools of instruction" and to be sold to owners in states with more rigid slave laws, where the "hope of emancipation was farther removed, if not hopeless." Real emancipation, he contended, would not be hastened by action of the convention.¹¹ Terry H. Cahal (Maury County) cautioned the convention against adopting any course which might seem to sanction the doctrine of the memorialists. The country, he pointed out, was alarmed because it had been misinformed. Cahal stressed the fact that he was the "master of no man," but he viewed as shortsighted any attempt to ameliorate the condition of one class of the community and thereby inflict irreparable injury on every class of society. He expressed a preference for McKinney as chairman of the committee and indicated that the memorialists should be told of the impracticability and warned of the "pernicious consequences" of their plans.¹² In presenting an emancipation memorial on May 24, Cahal had said that he recognized some of his "warmest and most devoted political friends" among the signers, but that they knew he would oppose in "every shape the object which their memorial sought to accomplish." He considered it his duty, however, to bring the "complaints" of all people of his county before the convention where "high, and low, and rich ought to be heard."¹³

¹⁰ *Journal of the Convention*, 72. The chairman of the committee of the whole was Newton Cannon, former Congressman and future governor, who was now a delegate from Williamson County.

¹¹ *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, June 10, 1834.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Ibid.*, May 29, 1834; *Athens Tennessee Journal*, June 11, 1834. Cahal was not a fanatical supporter of slavery in itself; he owned no slaves, and in 1830 had rendered valuable assistance to Josiah F. Polk, regional agent of the American Colonization Society, in the formation of the Columbia Colonization Society. *African Repository and Colonial Journal* (Washington, 1826-1892), VI (1830), 77.

Adam Huntsman (Madison County) informed the delegates that the slavery "excitement" had not spread its "blighting influence" as far west as his county. He contended that emancipation would be contrary to the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and since the Constitution was the supreme law of the land the Tennessee convention had no power to emancipate the slaves of that state. After several other speeches, whose contents were not reported, an effort to increase the size of the proposed committee to twenty members was defeated. Allen's original motion was then adopted, and President Carter appointed John A. McKinney, Robert Allen, and Adam Huntsman to the committee, with McKinney as chairman.¹⁴ With the committee appointed to draft the reasons for the refusal of the convention to consider the memorials in the committee of the whole, a motion by Huntsman to table until January 1, 1835, all petitions concerning slavery was approved by a vote of 38 to 20.¹⁵

Nelson J. Hess (Gibson County) and Willie Blount, on June 6 and June 18, respectively, presented rather comprehensive proposals con-

¹⁴ Nashville *Republican and State Gazette*, June 10, 1834. Allen requested to be relieved of the committee assignment and was replaced by Samuel B. Fogg of Davidson County. *Journal of the Convention*, 72. Huntsman was a member of Congress and political opponent of David Crockett. All members of the committee were lawyers.

Among the 60 delegates there were 32 farmers (10 East, 18 Middle, 4 West), 4 farmer-merchants (2 East, 2 Middle), 1 farmer-surveyor (Middle), 1 farmer-surveyor-merchant (East), 16 lawyers (3 East, 8 Middle, 5 West), 1 lawyer-Baptist minister (East), 1 lawyer-farmer (West), 1 physician (Middle), 1 physician-Cumberland Presbyterian minister (West), 1 merchant-Methodist minister (East), and 1 merchant (West). Thus, farmers and farmers with another occupation comprised 39 of the total membership of the convention: 7 of every 10 delegates of East and Middle Tennessee were in this category; 4 of every 10 from West Tennessee.

Also, 39 of the delegates were born outside the state: 18 in Virginia; 12 in North Carolina; 2 each in Pennsylvania, Ireland, and Kentucky; and 1 each in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Georgia. The other 21 were born in Tennessee or North Carolina-Tennessee.

The delegates were not as young as might have been expected in a western state that had felt the surge of democratic reform. The average age was slightly over 43 years; ranging from one delegate of 28 to two of 70 years. The 18 delegates from East Tennessee averaged slightly over 45 years; the 30 from Middle Tennessee a little more than 44 years; and the 12 from West Tennessee just under 40 years. These analyses were made from information contained in the *National Banner and Nashville Whig*, August 27, 1834, and the *Columbia Observer*, September 19, 1834.

¹⁵ Nashville *Republican and State Gazette*, June 10, 1834.

cerning various phases of the slavery and free Negro problems,¹⁶ but the calm of the convention was not disturbed until June 19, when McKinney presented the report of the committee. In making this report, McKinney stated that a majority of the members of the convention had been induced to "refuse to enter upon a lengthy discussion of the perplexing question" because of the "utter impracticability" of the plans proposed in the memorials. They could not see how any such plan could be accomplished, and they felt certain that discussion would produce "no result except the waste of time, the expenditure of money, and the destruction of harmony among the members, the preservation of which was so necessary for the accomplishment of the great work . . . of . . . the convention." The committee did not impugn the motives of the individual memorialists, he explained, and it freely admitted that slavery was an evil. At this point the committee reached the impasse so prevalent in the South at that time, for to tell how that evil could be removed was, in the words of the report, a question which the "wisest heads and the most benevolent hearts have not been able to answer in a satisfactory manner."¹⁷

McKinney contended that emancipating the slaves was not a guarantee of their being freed; in fact their condition would be less enviable. "The gates of society," he said, "are just as effectually barred against him . . . after he becomes a free man as while he is a real slave"; he would be beset with temptations, "strong, nay, almost irresistible, to the force of which in most cases he may be expected to yield"; his condition would be the "most forlorn and wretched that can be imagined," and he would be "degraded, despised, and trampled upon by the rest of the community." This portion of the report contrasting the conditions of the slave and free Negro—which caused the greatest amount of controversy—concluded with the following statement:

Unenviable as is the condition of the slave, unlovely as slavery is in all its aspects, bitter as the draught is that the slave is doomed to drink . . . his condition is better than the condition of the free men of color in the midst of

¹⁶ *Ibid.*; *Journal of the Convention*, 85; *Columbia Observer*, June 26, 1834.

¹⁷ *Journal of the Convention*, 87-88.

a community of white men, with whom he has no common interest, no fellow feeling, no equality. . . . The slave is almost wholly exempt from care, when his day's work is done he lies down and sleeps soundly. . . . He knows not at any time what it is to hear his children ask for bread when he has none to give them, they too are provided for.¹⁸

Though the committee deplored the condition of the slave, and did not sanction slavery as a good within itself, it did feel that it was to the benefit of the slave and society that—so long as the institution existed—slavery be distributed over as large an area as possible. The fulfillment of the "spread theory" assured better treatment for the slave and more security for society.¹⁹ The report then logically developed the thesis that abolishing slavery in Tennessee would not necessarily mean freeing the slaves since neither the convention, the legislature, nor the courts could prohibit the owners from moving beyond the limits of the state and settling their slaves elsewhere. Besides, it said, slaves were as well treated in Tennessee as anywhere that slavery existed; they were often taught to read, and they "have access to religious instruction and the means of grace in common with the rest of the community." Exceptions to these conditions were thought to be "*few and far between.*"²⁰

To this point the report had followed the lines of the more conservative defenses of slavery: the institution was an evil; those responsible for the political and social fabric did not know what other status could be given the Negro; and the economic and social position of the slave was as good as, or better than, that of the free Negro. Nor did the latter portion depart from the pattern. Fear was expressed that the newly freed slaves would be "strongly tempted to concert plans" with their "brothers in chains" for the "extermination of the white race" and would take "possession of the country." The colonization societies

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 89-90.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 90. A direct quotation from the committee report on this point is in William S. Jenkins, *Pro-Slavery Thought in the Old South* (Chapel Hill, 1935), 70, note 57. Jenkins gives a summary of the Tennessee convention actions on p. 88, note 109. A different type of summary may also be found in Chase C. Mooney, "Some Institutional and Statistical Aspects of Slavery in Tennessee," in *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (Nashville, 1942-), I (1942), 205-206.

²⁰ *Journal of the Convention*, 91.

were viewed as a "door of hope, which is every day opening wider and wider," and the memorialists were asked not to "dread that slavery will be perpetual."²¹

The lengthy report concluded with a denunciation of the northern abolitionists for their agitation and their interference in what was considered the personal affairs of another section. It stated, in part, that "if misguided fanatics, in those parts of the United States where slavery does not now exist, will only refrain from intermeddling in a matter in which they have no concern and in which their interference can do no positive good and may do positive evil, slavery, with all its ills, will be extinguished as certainly and as speedily as the friends of humanity have any reason to expect."²²

This report, considered by some as an apology for slavery, reflects accurately the tactics employed in 1834 by the Tennesseans in justifying the retention of the status quo. They did not, despite the abolition crusade, uphold the institution as a positive good, but frankly and assertively admitted that it was an evil, and confessed that unwillingness to change was motivated by the fear that the adjustment to the changed relationships of Negro and white could not be accomplished, or accepted, peaceably. Not slavery, but the race problem was the real difficulty.²³

Five days later, on June 24, this report was called up and read. McKinney stated that the committee did not wish to force the report on the convention, and that he was willing for anyone to enter a protest and, if possible, to point out a better way of handling the issue than simply letting it alone. In the discussion which followed, the action of the committee was attacked as "flaunting the public opinion of the state," but the chief controversy centered about the section of the report which contrasted the condition of the slaves and the free

²¹ *Ibid.*, 92. Colonization had little effect on slavery in Tennessee, for from 1829 through 1866 only 870 had been colonized in Liberia. *Memorial of the Semi-Centennial Anniversary of the American Colonization Society* (Washington, 1867), 182-90.

²² *Journal of the Convention*, 93.

²³ For a discussion of the race problem as related to slavery, see Ulrich B. Phillips, "The Central Theme of Southern History," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXXIV (1928), 30-43.

colored. Leading the antislavery forces in this instance were Joseph Kincaid (Bedford County) and Richard Bradshaw (Jefferson County); but they were ably supported by James Gillespy (Blount County), John McGaughey (Greene County), and Matthew Stephenson.²⁴ Kincaid remarked that a free black could "expatriate himself, and leave the state with the same freedom that the chairman of the committee who wrote that report could do." Upon being asked by McKinney where the Negro could go, Kincaid spoke at some length on the comparative rights and privileges which the free colored enjoyed over the slaves, and moved to strike out that portion of the report which dealt with the subject.

Cahal, who owned no slaves and who had been active in support of the colonization movement only a few years before, rose in defense of the report, pointing out that the convention had decided not to act on the slavery question in the committee of the whole and consequently he had thought he would hear no more on the subject. He was against striking out a word, and felt that any who from misguided zeal or philanthropic motive had signed the memorials should hear the report. With the fanatic and zealot, however, it would not "weigh a feather in the balance," he said, for they were deaf to the voice of reason. Slavery, he continued, was a great political and moral evil which he sincerely desired abolished whenever its abolition would not afflict a "greater curse than slavery . . . upon us—the subversion of our prosperity, and the moral and political degradation of our people." He was convinced that the Negroes did not want emancipation if it meant colonization, for they understood those terms to be banishment to a "strange and distant land—an inhospitable wilderness in a sickly and barbarous clime." He asserted that he would go to the "western wilderness" rather than live with 140,000 free blacks in Tennessee, and maintained that Kincaid and others had reflected dishonor on the signers of the

²⁴ Kincaid was a physician, Stephenson a farmer-surveyor-merchant, and the other three were farmers. McGaughey and McKinney still had different viewpoints in 1861; the former went with the Union, the latter with the Confederacy. They were the only two persons still living who had taken a prominent part in the 1834 convention. Oliver P. Temple, *East Tennessee and the Civil War* (Cincinnati, 1899), 108.

Declaration of Independence by insinuating that they had meditated a revolution in the social system. Cahal concluded his defense with a tribute to liberty and order and warned that these could not exist if the slaves were freed. "Liberty, lovely as she is in my eyes is not the only Deity at whose shrine I desire to worship," he said. "There is another to be more adored. It is order. The liberty I prize is a liberty regulated by law, which secures peace and order. Liberate your slaves and attempt to elevate them to equality with their masters, and she will soon take flight from this favored land."²⁵

Several other speeches, mostly repetitive, attacked various portions of the report, and then Kincaid's motion was defeated, 42 to 12. With the exception of G. W. L. Marr, of Obion County, and Kincaid, the supporters of the motion were delegates from East Tennessee or from Middle Tennessee areas in which there were few slaves.²⁶ The convention then adopted the special report by a vote of 44 to 10. In this roll call James Gray and Boling Gordon of Middle Tennessee, Marr of West Tennessee, and John Kelly of East Tennessee, who had voted for striking out the most controversial portion, voted in favor of the entire document. Robert J. McKinney (Greene County) and John Neal (McMinn County), who had voted against the Kincaid motion, voted against adoption of the report.

It would seem that this action might have ended the discussion of

²⁵ Nashville *Republican and State Gazette*, June 26 and July 10, 1834. The earlier issue has the fullest available account of the convention proceedings of June 24, but contains only a portion of Cahal's speech. A summary of the proceedings appears in the *Journal of the Convention*, 98-99. Cahal, in stressing his point that the Negroes did not want emancipation and colonization, stated that some free Negroes did not vote for him because it was rumored that he favored emancipation.

²⁶ The twelve were: Hugh Armstrong (Fentress), Richard Bradshaw (Jefferson), James Gillespy (Blount), Boling Gordon (Hickman), James Gray (Stewart), John Kelly (Marion), Bradley Kimbrough (Monroe), Joseph Kincaid (Bedford), John McGaughey (Greene), Joseph Mabry (Knox), G. W. L. Marr (Obion), and Matthew Stephenson (Washington). *Journal of the Convention*, 99; Nashville *Republican and State Gazette*, June 26, 1834. Of the twelve men, eight were farmers, one a farmer-lawyer, one a lawyer-Baptist minister, one a farmer-surveyor-merchant, and one a physician. Of the farmers, all were from East Tennessee or the Highland Rim counties of Middle Tennessee. The county of residence of the delegates is given; in some instances several counties were combined to form a district; in other cases a single county had more than one delegate.

slavery, but such was not to be the case. Since the McKinney committee had stated the reasons for the convention's refusal to consider the memorials in the committee of the whole, Stephenson, McGaughey, Bradshaw, Gillespy, and Kincaid apparently felt compelled to state their reasons for voting against adoption of the report.²⁷ This statement of reasons was actually a protest against the original report. The group maintained not only that the importance of the subject—involving the political and moral interest and safety of the state—and the number and respectability of the memorialists merited more consideration than the appointment of a three-man committee, but also that the principles assumed and the arguments used in the report were “in their tendency subversive to the true principles of Republicanism,” against the liberties of the Declaration of Independence, and at variance with the spirit of the Gospel. Further, they said that the memorialists had presented no definite plan, but had merely asked that the convention take the subject under consideration and “endeavor to devise some means by which the State will ultimately be delivered from the curse and evil of slavery.”

The protesters stated that they could not subscribe to the rule that would “assign to men their rights according to different shades of colour,” and they felt that the evils of freedmen applied in equal force to slaves, “unless indeed slavery gives dignity to man.” It was conceded that some masters would send their slaves to other areas rather than be deprived of vested rights, but the same spirit would prompt them to dispose of slaves whenever they found it more profitable than keeping them. They asserted that a “large portion of the memorialists were slaveholders” and branded the report as a “kind of apology for slavery.”²⁸

On June 28, for the first and only time during the convention period, a Nashville paper commented editorially on the slavery issue. On that day the *National Banner and Nashville Daily Advertiser* expressed the hope that the McKinney report would be “read with attention by every citizen of the State,” and stated that although the paper could

²⁷ It should be noted that all but Kincaid were from East Tennessee.

²⁸ Nashville *Republican and State Gazette*, June 28, 1834; *Journal of the Convention*, 102-104.

not subscribe to the "opinion so candidly and honestly avowed" in the Stephenson protest there were those who would read it "with pleasure." Following these remarks was a reprint of an article by a "gentleman high in the ministry of a highly respected church," which had appeared in the *Revivalist* of June 25. This article deplored the continued existence of slavery, but presented the race issue as the greatest obstacle to changing the status of the Negro. The writer was not adamant, but reserved judgment for himself by saying that when a plan was devised which would "obtain for the colored man the enjoyment of liberty, without subverting the order of society, we will rejoice to exercise all our weak energies in helping to put it into execution."

The issue was reopened in the convention on June 28 with the adoption of a motion of Gray Garrett (Claiborne County) to return the memorials to the special committee and ask for another report giving more complete information concerning the number of memorials and memorialists, the number of slaveholding signers, the counties from which the memorials came, and the plans of the petitioners. The convention then turned its attention to other topics while waiting for the committee to prepare the desired information, and the question of slavery was ignored until the new report was presented on July 9.

In preparing this new report, the committee went far beyond the confines of its instructions. First of all, it argued that if the many charges made in the Stephenson protest were true, the convention had been "exceedingly blameable" for receiving the first report. The information sought by Garrett's motion was then given,²⁹ and the last half of the document was devoted to refuting the charges of the "abolition" group. Thus the committee was defending its first report, just as the Stephenson group had felt compelled to justify its vote against it. Charge had brought countercharge. The committee now asserted that the convention and the first report had dealt rather gently with the issue. It explained that the memorials had all been read; that no one had impugned the motives of the memorialists; and that it was a mark of respect to them that the committee had been appointed. The first

²⁹ See above, p. 489, for a summary of this information.

report, it continued, might have denounced the signatory slaveholders for not freeing their slaves before asking others to release their property or to bear the expense of colonizing someone else's Negroes; or it might have told the non-slaveholder that he was not guilty of the "sin" of holding another in bondage, and that his crop was not injured nor his "soil cursed" with the sweat of the slave. Rather than using this reproachful method, those groups had been told why it was impracticable to set the slaves free. The protesters had not, it was contended, shown how the report had been subversive; on the other hand, the report had sought to uphold the aims of Republicanism of promoting peace, protecting property, and preserving the rights and privileges of all members of the community. The issue of the Gospel was left for others to decide: a neighbor could not be compelled to do something simply because you thought it was right. The convention was warned that "great mischief" could be done by "raising the expectations of any class of the community, which are not to be, and which cannot be, realized." The motives of the protesters were questioned with the expression that "there is something very uncandid in condemning others for not adopting a measure which the fault finders would have been the last to have adopted."³⁰

The report was laid on the table, but not before Stephenson had attacked it as containing "aspersions of the moral principles" of those who had protested against the earlier report, and had condemned the committee for answering the protest. Gillespy, however, felt "highly honored" by the notice given the protest, but he emphasized the fact that the document went well beyond the specified objects of the Garrett motion.³¹

One week later, on July 16, Garrett moved to take up the report, but presently changed his motion to provide for dispensing with the document. The convention voiced approval of this move.³² Stephenson, Bradshaw, and McGaughey, however, seemed determined to keep the

³⁰ The report appears in the *Journal of the Convention*, 125-31, and in the *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, July 15, 1834.

³¹ *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, July 12, 1834.

³² *Journal of the Convention*, 141.

matter before the convention, for on July 21 they entered a second protest.³³ These East Tennesseans chided the committee members for the time expended on the second report, branded the report as "labored," and described the defense as an "ocean into a tempest wrought to waft a feather or to drown a fly." The spontaneity of their first protest had caused them to err concerning the widespread character of the memorials, they explained, and they thought it unfair to "make a man an offender for a word." Further, they insisted, the fact that a scheme is visionary—"if a thing in itself is right"—is not a reason for refusing to do it at all. No effort was made by them to single out subversive features of the first report, but they suggested that if the petitioners had been answered in the manner that the second report said they might have been, then the right of petition and the "right of complaining or asking relief from what they feel to be evils" would have been denied. Finally, they asserted that since slavery had not been denounced, the committee had given "countenance to slavery in its worst form."

In reply, McKinney accused the group of engaging in an "electioneering trick, a mere vote-catching business," and contended that only the incendiary potentialities of the protest had made it worthy of attention. He challenged Stephenson and the others to point out the charges against their moral characters; if they could, he would consent to have those portions expunged. The intimation that the report implied that "high heaven and its ministers" had sanctioned slavery he termed a "wilful perversion of the plain and obvious import."³⁴

The impression is gained that by this time the real issue had almost been lost in the melange of attacks and defenses, that each group was desirous of having the "last word," that satire and taunting had replaced conviction and logical reasons, and that the issue was kept alive long after the problems immediately involved had been settled.³⁵

³³ *Ibid.*, 147-51; *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, July 26, 1834. Kincaid and Gillespy did not join in this protest.

³⁴ *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, September 9, 1834. It is not known on what day these remarks were made; there is no record of them in the *Journal of the Convention*, and the *Gazette* did not give the date.

³⁵ The *Fayetteville Independent Yeoman*, July 31, 1834, took notice of this second

On July 24, McKinney and his colleagues were discharged from further consideration of the memorials, and these were referred back to the convention and laid on the table. There was to be still another outburst—even after the constitutional provision had been adopted on July 30. On August 5, Kincaid asked that a paper stating his reasons for voting against the *first* report be considered. The request was granted and he then read a statement, later inserted in the *Journal of the Convention*, in which he objected especially to the portion contrasting the conditions of the free colored and the slaves, and charged that the committee thought free Negroes should be subjected to slavery to better their condition. Then, after stating his belief that the majority of the slaveholders were not humane masters, he denounced both slavery and slaveholders at considerable length.³⁶

The constitutional provision, adopted on July 30 with practically no discussion, stipulated that "the General Assembly shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves without the consent of their owner or owners."³⁷ The vote on adoption of this section was very close, 30 to 27. Several of the twenty-seven seem to have voted against it not because they were opposed to slavery but because they felt that no limitation or encumbrances should be placed on the power of the assembly over slavery. Be that as it may, fourteen of the dissenters to this provision were from East, ten from Middle, and three from West Tennessee.³⁸

exchange, but stated that since neither of them "contained much that was new or important we are willing to let both of them rest where they are."

³⁶ *Journal of the Convention*, 222-28. No other such statement concerning Tennessee slaveholders has been found outside the true abolition "literature." Newton Cannon could not see why it was necessary for Kincaid, in simply giving the reasons for his vote, to have "indulged in such a tirade against slavery and slave holders." *National Banner and Nashville Daily Advertiser*, August 22, 1834. The date of Cannon's remark was not given.

³⁷ Tennessee Constitution of 1834, Art. II, Sec. 31. This provision was first introduced by Nelson J. Hess on June 6 and originally contained a clause requiring that the master be compensated for the slaves set free. *Journal of the Convention*, 71. The provision was repealed by amendment in 1865.

³⁸ It will be recalled that there were 18 delegates from East, 30 from Middle, and 12 from West Tennessee. The twenty-seven were: Hugh C. Armstrong (Fentress), Richard Bradshaw (Jefferson), Terry Cahal (Maury), William B. Carter (Carter), Maclin Cross (McNairy), James Gillespy (Blount), James Gray (Stewart), John Kelly (Marion), Bradley Kimbrough (Monroe), Joseph Kincaid (Bedford), A. A. Kincannon (Lincoln),

An issue closely allied with the eventual extinction of slavery was that of Negro suffrage, which caused relatively brief but sharp discussion in the convention. Under the state constitution of 1796 the free Negro in Tennessee possessed the right to vote, and it was inevitable that the question of continuing this provision in the new constitution should come up for consideration. On May 27 William Ledbetter (Rutherford County) introduced a motion that the right to vote be taken from the free colored and that they be exempted from military service;³⁹ but the matter lay practically undisturbed until after the first report of the McKinney committee. On June 26, however, Terry Cahal spoke to the question. Referring to speeches which had been made by James W. Smith (Jackson County) and Isaac Walton (Sumner County),⁴⁰ he stated that they were calculated, because of the "high moral worth" and "patriarchal voice of the venerable gentlemen," to exert over the convention members a more "powerful influence than the most elaborate and eloquent arguments of younger men." He personally favored the retention of the voting privilege by the free colored who then enjoyed it, because this would not have the "semblance of injustice about it," and he insisted that when the constitution of 1796 had been framed the "welfare of the country" and the "interest of prosperity" required that the free colored be allowed to vote. The situation had since changed. To send free Negroes out of the country would be worse than to reduce them to slavery, but to give the right to vote to that group, which was rapidly increasing, would be an injustice to posterity and an injury to the people of the state. "Let Ten-

Joseph A. Mabry (Knox), Abram McClellan (Sullivan), John McGaughey (Greene), John A. McKinney (Hawkins), Robert J. McKinney (Greene), John Montgomery (Dickson), John Neal (McMinn), George W. Richardson (Franklin), William C. Roadman (Cocke), James Scott (Hardin), William T. Senter (Rhea), William C. Smartt (Warren), Matthew Stephenson (Washington), Ennis Ury (Carroll), Isaac Walton (Sumner), and Jonathan Webster (Bedford). *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, August 5, 1834. With the exception of Marr and Boling Gordon, all who had voted for Kincaid's motion to strike out a portion of McKinney's first report are in this list. Even more interesting, however, is the inclusion of the names of Terry Cahal and John A. McKinney.

³⁹ *Journal of the Convention*, 37.

⁴⁰ These speeches have not been located. Walton had participated in the constitutional convention of 1796.

nessee become the asylum for free negroes and the harbour for runaway slaves from other states," he continued, "with the same right of suffrage, extended to the white and black man, with the influx of population which must ensue, because it is a sort of invitation to them to come, and the degradation and injury which we would inflict on posterity would call down on this convention its execration."⁴¹

Cahal then presented to the delegates several observations on what he considered to be important concepts of society and government. In his opinion, no amount of oratory could convince the white that he was not superior to the Negro; there was no more a *natural right* to vote than a *natural right* to hold office; suffrage was a privilege conferred by the people; if it were a natural right, it would apply also to women, minors, and slaves; there were no natural rights in government, for all depended on convention and compact; and in society the social, political, and constitutional rights replaced natural rights.

On the following day, June 27, there was brief discussion on limiting the suffrage to white freemen, the interpretation of "freehold" as used in the suffrage article, and the possibility of limiting the vote of the free colored to county elections. Robert Allen maintained that all the privileges of the free colored were a "boon not a right" and that they should not be placed on any other basis. A resolution by Marr that United States citizenship be the prerequisite for voting in Tennessee was tabled on motion of Bradley Kimbrough, of East Tennessee.⁴²

Marr, however, rejoined the issue on June 28 by presenting a resolution stating that all free persons of color, "mustees," and Indians were not parties to the political compact, nor subject to naturalization laws, and thus not entitled to participate in elections. After the resolution was referred to the committee of the whole, he stated that the whites and blacks could not live together in equality, that the people "reprobate and abhor" Negro suffrage, and that the convention had authority to grant suffrage only to citizens of the United States. Thus, the ad-

⁴¹ Nashville *Republican and State Gazette*, July 10, 1834.

⁴² *Ibid.*, July 1, 1834.

monition of prudence, the voice of the people, and the want of power precluded the continuation of this privilege for the free men of color.⁴³

On the same day, June 28, William H. Loving (Haywood County), who was perhaps the most outspoken delegate against Negro suffrage, spoke at length on the issue. He was "truly astonished and regretted" to see "old grey headed gentlemen" contending for the proposition to let free Negroes and mulattoes exercise the "highest right and privilege in a free government." Chiding the members for refusing to lower the voting age for the white and then contending for Negro suffrage, he maintained that, as in the case of emancipation, the question of granting the ballot to the free colored was not a question of right and wrong but one of policy and expediency. Not only were the free colored "in the habit of trading with our slaves and corrupting them," the West Tennessean asserted, but many might be considered as "brokers" in the disposal of property stolen by slaves and thus they became the "corrupt link between the debased of our own color and the slaves." Continuing to press the race problem, he described the fact that the free Negro had been able to vote as "an evil example to our slaves of an incalculable extent," because the slave could see no difference in color, or in moral or intellectual advancement, between himself and the free Negro. Reflections on this disparity of privileges, he said, must awaken and excite feelings of a "most delicate nature, embracing within their range, the overthrow or total extinction of the white race, one instance of which is yet fresh in our memory—that of the ill-fated Island of St. Domingo."⁴⁴

Little more was said concerning the qualifications of the voters. The suffrage article as presented to the committee of the whole granted the franchise to "every freeman of the age of twenty-one years and upwards" with the usual qualifications of citizenship and a certain period of residence within the state.⁴⁵ On July 31 a motion to insert "white"

⁴³ *Ibid.*, July 15, 1834. A portion of Marr's remarks appears also in the *Journal of the Convention*, 107.

⁴⁴ *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, July 5, 1834. Loving supported Cahal's arguments concerning the nature of the exercise of the franchise, which he termed a "conventional" right.

⁴⁵ *Journal of the Convention*, 171.

after "free" was carried by a vote of 33 to 23, and the amended provision was adopted on that day.⁴⁶ A motion to allow the free colored who then enjoyed the suffrage to retain that privilege was defeated, 34 to 22, but one providing that they be exempt from poll tax prevailed.⁴⁷ The franchise was thus limited to free white males of twenty-one years or over with the proviso, introduced by John A. McKinney, that "no person shall be disqualified from voting in any election . . . who is now by the existing laws . . . a competent witness in a court of justice against a white man."⁴⁸

The constitution of 1796 had provided that representation in the General Assembly should be based on the number of taxable inhabitants,⁴⁹ which, since they were subject to capitation taxes, included both slaves and the free colored. After the slavery and suffrage issues had been decided in the 1834 convention, it was proposed that since free colored were to be excluded from voting they should not be counted in determining representation.⁵⁰ This motion was referred to the committee of the whole, and with little comment it was decided that representation in the assembly be based on qualified voters—thus excluding free colored and slaves.⁵¹ At a later date when the slave population of the western area constituted a much greater proportion of the total this proposal likely would have encountered considerable opposition.

One other issue, the taxation of slaves as property, was the occasion of brief comment. The constitution of 1796 had provided that for purposes of taxation no slave should be valued higher than two hundred

⁴⁶ This vote was quite similar to the one of July 30 concerning the emancipation powers of the General Assembly. Of those voting for circumscribing the power of the Assembly, five voted against the suffrage article, while eight of those who had voted against the limitation on the Assembly, voted for the suffrage article.

⁴⁷ *Journal of the Convention*, 209.

⁴⁸ This allowed persons of color who had only one-sixteenth non-Caucasian blood to vote. *Acts of the Territory Southwest of the River Ohio*, 1794, Chap. 1, Sec. 32. Free colored were exempted from military service as well as from the payment of a poll tax. Constitution of 1834, Art. IV, Sec. 1.

⁴⁹ Art. I, Sec. 2.

⁵⁰ *Journal of the Convention*, 214. On June 16 Loving had proposed that the basis of representation be either the free white taxable inhabitants or the qualified voters. *Ibid.*, 81.

⁵¹ Constitution of 1834, Art. II, Sec. 5.

acres of land.⁵² Since each one hundred acres of land was subject to the same amount of taxation, the inequity of the provision is apparent. On June 16 Burchett Douglass (Wilson County) moved that land and slaves be taxed according to value, but that all slaves under ten and over fifty years of age be exempt from taxation.⁵³ On the following day Hugh Armstrong (Fentress County) proposed the same value-basis for taxation, but included all slaves as taxable property.⁵⁴

Comment on the issue subsided until the convention reached the stage of article-by-article reading of the proposed new constitution. When this particular section came up for consideration on August 12, McKinney moved that Armstrong's proposal be changed to include only slaves between 12 and 50 years of age.⁵⁵ There was some opposition to this proposal, with the most outspoken criticism coming from James W. Smith, who could see no justice in exempting the younger and older slaves. Smith maintained that one of his most valuable slaves was past sixty, and that slaves from one to twelve were worth from \$100 to \$300. His conscience, he said, would not allow him to vote for a system that placed a tax on everything the non-slaveholder owned and exempted from taxation a valuable portion of the slaveowners' wealth.⁵⁶ McKinney's motion prevailed, and all slaves between 12 and 50 were subject to taxation according to value.⁵⁷

In summary, it can be said that although antislavery sentiment in Tennessee had lost its force as an organized movement by 1834, a few determined individuals wished to see the constitutional convention take action providing for an ultimate abolition of slavery in the state. Their efforts were not successful, and what was done in the convention apparently had little effect upon the public. The newspapers almost in-

⁵² Art. I, Sec. 26. For a discussion of the land speculators' influence on the taxation provisions of the 1796 constitution, see Gordon T. Chappell, "Land Speculation and Taxation in Tennessee, 1790-1834" (M. A. thesis, Vanderbilt University, 1936).

⁵³ *Journal of the Convention*, 81.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 82.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 268.

⁵⁶ *Nashville Republican and State Gazette*, August 30, 1834. These remarks were made on August 29, but there is no record of them in the *Journal*.

⁵⁷ Constitution of 1834, Art. II, Sec. 28.

variably avoided the issue, simply reporting the happenings of the assemblage without editorial comment. No delegate expressed the conviction that slavery was a positive good; and many of the defenders of the existing system admitted that it was an evil, but confessed their inability to cope with the race problems which, in their opinion, would have been vastly accentuated by emancipation. They felt that as long as the Negro was to remain within the United States, the difficulties and frictions would be reduced if he remained in slavery and if slavery were spread over as large an area as possible.

The sequence of events in the convention seems to indicate that both the majority and the minority groups at times avoided the main problems which were before them and engaged in tactics that delayed a disposition of the issue. It was not, for example, until after the report stating the reasons for declining to consider the memorials in the committee of the whole, that the actions sought by the memorialists were analyzed and placed before the convention. The first statement of the minority group—ostensibly in defense of their vote—was more an attack upon the content of the report than an apology for their action. Their second statement went even further and accused the three-man committee of countenancing slavery. The committee, in delivering its second report, went far beyond its charge and retaliated in kind to the accusations of the protesters. The willingness of the convention to allow Kincaid to “explain” his vote reveals the length to which the majority was willing to go in order to prevent any implication that freedom of speech, expression, or petition was being denied.

Although only twelve members voted to strike out that portion of the McKinney report which contrasted the condition of the slave and free Negro, the vote on the constitutional provision was very close, 30 to 27. This vote seems to bear no direct relation to the slavery sentiments of the individuals, but appears rather to have hinged about the wisdom of limiting the power of the legislature on such an important issue. Similarly, there appears to have been no close connection between the support of slavery and opposition to Negro suffrage. Marr, very outspoken against suffrage, voted to strike out the portion of the

report contrasting the slave and the free colored, but he voted for adoption of the entire report.

Although the free Negro and slavery issue was the cause of considerable debate in the convention, controversy seems to have subsided almost completely with adjournment. In addition to showing that not all Southerners defended slavery in 1834, this episode also revealed the fact that not all of the defenders considered it as a positive good. Many of those who advocated the retention of the status quo felt that slavery was an evil, but it was the only sensible and feasible solution which they could see for the race problem.

The Virginia Central Railroad at War, 1861-1865

BY CHARLES W. TURNER

The American Civil War was the first military conflict in which railroads were a highly important factor. The lines which had been operating in the South for more than twenty-five years had by 1860 formed a fairly complete network of iron tracks over the Confederacy. Trade and travel could flow with reasonable ease over this web, the destruction of which was to be a major goal of the Federal armies.

In the South before 1860, the purchase of railroad stock was considered a safe investment and a large majority of the stockholders were local people. Though the roads paid good dividends, they were poorly equipped, and material was purchased largely from northern manufacturers. When the war broke out the less-used extensions were discontinued, and only a few strategic links were added to connect vital lines. As the war developed, the raids, the wear, and the lack of labor and supplies steadily crippled the railroads to an increasing degree. The invading forces used ties for firewood, and both depots and rolling stock were burned. By 1865 ruin and destruction had spread from Virginia to Georgia and Mississippi, and the total assets of all the Confederate rail lines equaled only one-third that of 1861. The story of finances was no brighter. The credit of the companies declined, interest went unpaid, and mortgages piled up. Dividends were periodically declared, in spite of the fact that the original capital was being spent to provide for the upkeep and equipment. Their principal customer, the Confederate government, paid the lines in bonds and paper currency, which became practically worthless before 1865.

The Confederate government had been slow to assume control over its transportation systems, though the companies were faced with serious financial difficulties, shortage of equipment, loss of men to the service, frequent raids, numerous loadings, and congestion in movements of troops and supplies. In fact, nominal government control came only on February 28, 1865.

During these trying times the railroad personnel strove valiantly to keep the lines in operation.¹ The roads were invaluable to the Confederacy, especially in facilitating the war of movement which was basic in Confederate strategy. To show these contributions, the war history of the Virginia Central is presented as a case study. The nucleus of the Virginia Central was the Louisa Railroad, which first extended beyond the boundaries of Louisa County in 1840 and which was officially designated by the legislature in 1850 as the Virginia Central.² This line was the original unit of the Chesapeake and Ohio system of today. The road was particularly strategic in that the tracks spanned most of the eastern battle areas, carried men and material of the Valley of Virginia to and fro, and afforded the most ready contact of the Tidewater with the Piedmont and mountain regions of the state. In 1860 twenty-five engines of the Virginia Central ran over a track slightly more than two hundred miles in length, extending from Richmond to Jackson's River near Clifton Forge. The western extension, from Clifton Forge to the Ohio River, was being surveyed and the legislature was considering the building of the line entirely with state funds. With a capital of nearly \$4,000,000 and dividends of four per cent declared semi-annually, the company could plan to help in this expansion. Of its more than a thousand stockholders, the state remained its largest single purchaser of securities and thus had the privilege of selecting three of its five directors. Augusta, Greenbrier, and Monroe counties

¹ For more complete information on the problems of southern railroads in the Civil War, see Charles W. Ramsdell, "The Confederate Government and the Railroads," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXII (1917), 794-804, and Carl R. Fish, "The Restoration of the Southern Railroads," in *University of Wisconsin Studies in the Social Sciences and History* (Madison, 1918-), No. 2 (1919), 1-28.

² See Charles W. Turner, "The Louisa Railroad" (M. A. thesis, University of North Carolina, 1940).

controlled a block of a thousand shares of stock, while the remainder of the stock had been bought by individuals who, with two exceptions, owned less than five hundred shares apiece.³ In their annual meetings these stockholders heard the report of the president on the fiscal conditions of the company, considered his recommendations, and elected a president and two of the five directors for the next year.

In the two decades prior to the close of the Civil War the president of the Virginia Central was Edmund Fontaine, who managed the affairs of the company with great skill. In November, 1865, he was defeated by Williams C. Wickham of Hanover, who had been a brigadier general in the Confederate army, but Fontaine was re-elected the following year. At the stockholders' meeting in which he was defeated, Fontaine declared:

I have been connected with this road from its earliest infancy to its present maturity. I had the honor to represent the district in the senate when the road was chartered; when the company was organized, I was appointed the first proxy to represent the state's interest; thence, director for several years until I was made president of the company. For the services I rendered during the many difficulties which attended the prosecution of the work westward, I have had due credit given me; and indeed, I now desire to say that the meed of praise which was bestowed on me should be divided by the Board of Directors and the faithful subordinate officers.⁴

Another important official who remained on the job throughout the entire period was Henry D. Whitcomb, engineer and superintendent, who was largely responsible for keeping the trains running. To him came numerous complaints of the lack of service and of high rates. It was he who in 1865 adopted the system of track maintenance in which rail mileage was broken down into divisions or sections with a foreman and three to five laborers responsible for each section.⁵ The remainder

³ Lists of the stockholders are in a document box labeled "Virginia Central Railroad" in the office of the State Corporation Commission of Virginia, in Richmond. The box also contains many miscellaneous papers pertaining to the railroad's development between 1836 and 1865.

⁴ Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, November 25, 1865. See also, Annual Report of the Virginia Central Railroad Company, 1860-1861 (MS. in office of Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad Company in Richmond).

⁵ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works to the General Assembly of Virginia* (Richmond, 1816-), 1866.

of the personnel consisted of John Garrett, secretary-treasurer, and more than five hundred individuals—the ticket agents, conductors, freight runners, road and section masters, mechanics, watchmen, engineers, and laborers, including slaves.⁶

The question of obtaining skilled and unskilled day laborers became an increasingly important problem during the war. Besides continual wage increases, conscription took its toll early in the war, for railroad employees were not excused from military service. The usual procedure was to replace all types of employees with disabled veterans. This practice continued until 1864, when the president of the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad joined those of other roads in protesting to the Confederate Congress against indiscriminate conscription of railroad employees. They requested that the War Department take up the matter and afford the companies some relief. The necessity for skilled labor was pointed out, and they claimed that to carry in five days what a single rail line could haul in one would require one thousand wagons, five thousand horses, and an adequate number of drivers.⁷ In the spring of 1864 the Confederate Congress passed an act exempting from military service a certain number of skilled railroad laborers, especially mechanics, for railroad duty, with the provision that these men might be called back into military service if an emergency developed.⁸ The act did not solve the problem, however, and in the following December the board of directors of the Virginia Central resolved "that the superintendent be instructed to employ men over forty years in every case when suitable persons to perform the duties can be found and that no assistant agent be retained who is between the ages of eighteen and forty-five unless he is exempt from military duty."⁹

Slave labor was used throughout the period, but slaves were both hard to get and to keep. From time to time raiders would take off groups that were employed along the line. For example, thirty Negroes

⁶ *Ibid.*, 1861, p. 66.

⁷ *Richmond Daily Dispatch*, January 12, 1864.

⁸ *Annual Report of the Virginia Central Railroad*, 1864, p. 12.

⁹ Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, December 14, 1864 (MS. in office of Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad Company).

were seized by Federal troops at Frederick Hall in August, 1862.¹⁰ So great became the need for slave labor that in 1863 the Virginia legislature authorized the governor to impress slaves for use of the Virginia Central.¹¹ The line purchased thirty-five Negro men for \$83,484 during the same year, and other purchases were made later.¹² At no time during the entire period did the road have a sufficient labor force, although the superintendent of transportation periodically reminded the governor and the Confederacy of the railroad shortages.¹³

During the war years the state government did not attempt to regulate or control the railroad. It continued to appoint its representatives on the board of directors, as it had done under the legislative acts of 1836 and 1857, and it required the company to file annual reports with the state auditor,¹⁴ but it did not make appropriations for westward extension of the line as it formerly had done. In 1861 the Confederate government placed railroad supervision under Quartermaster General Abraham C. Myers, who was to co-ordinate the lines and see that troops and supplies were carried at the special rates agreed upon in the southern national and state conventions. William S. Ashe was appointed his assistant in the summer of 1861, and was sent over the Virginia Central and other lines to inspect and to make contracts for the Confederacy. At his request the board of directors on September 26, 1861, ordered that daily trains should be run as far as Jackson's River for troops to and from Richmond.¹⁵ This arrangement with Myers and Ashe proved unsatisfactory, however, and Colonel William M. Wadley was made supervisor of railroads under the Confederate Department of War in

¹⁰ Richmond *Daily Dispatch*, August 8, 1862.

¹¹ Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, October 1, 1863.

¹² Annual Report of the Virginia Central Railroad, 1865, p. 17.

¹³ Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, August 4, 1863.

¹⁴ These acts required that the state buy two-fifths, and later three-fifths of the shares of stock of each railroad company chartered by the General Assembly. The Board of Public Works could then appoint three of the usual five members of the Board of Directors of each company, and could require each to present an annual report on its current financial progress and other activities. See Joseph Tate (comp.), *Digest of the Laws of Virginia* (2nd ed., Richmond, 1841), 762-73; James M. Matthews (comp.), *Digest of the Laws of Virginia*, 2 vols. (Richmond, 1856-1857), I, 331-32.

¹⁵ Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, September 26, 1861; Ramsdell, "Confederate Government and the Railroads," *loc. cit.*, 794.

December, 1862. Wadley called a conference of all southern railroads to meet in Augusta, Georgia, early in 1863, at which an attempt was made to consolidate all lines in the Confederacy into a single unit. The superintendent of each railroad was ordered to send in weekly reports to Wadley, and their schedules were subject to his approval.¹⁶ This control proved too rigid, however, and Frederick W. Sims, who appeared to understand railroad men and who earnestly tried to improve railroad equipment, was placed at the head of an Engineering Bureau.

Direct government control was suggested in a bill which was presented to the Confederate Congress in 1861. The proposal was defeated, but a committee of that body recommended that all lines through Richmond be placed under military control. It was not until February, 1865, however, that an act was passed authorizing the secretary of war to place any railroad, canal, or telegraph line under such officials as he should designate to keep them in repair and to operate the lines. All damages inflicted would be met by the Confederate government. By the time this act was enforced the war had been concluded.¹⁷ Rigid military control came only after Appomattox, when the Federal government sequestered every Virginia railroad line.

Generally speaking, the Confederate government respected the rights of the Virginia Central and other companies and rarely interfered with their management. Some of the officers of the southern army attempted to assume command of the trains, however, especially during the first years of the war. Often a threat of collision resulted from confusion in train orders. For example, in 1861 a train of southern soldiers came from Lynchburg to Charlottesville over the Alexandria and Orange Railroad. Two soldiers rode in the cab, holding the engineer under arrest. When the engines were switched at Gordonsville, the engineer of the Virginia Central refused to run his train under arrest, and the soldiers were removed.¹⁸

Prior to the outbreak of the Civil War the Virginia Central, with the

¹⁶ Richmond *Daily Examiner*, December 10, 1862.

¹⁷ Ramsdell, "Confederate Government and the Railroads," *loc. cit.*, 804.

¹⁸ Charles S. Anderson, "Train Running with the Confederacy," in *Locomotive Engineering* (New York, 1888-1928), VI (1893), 177.

active support of the state government, had projected the construction of a line from Jackson's River to the Ohio River, known as the Covington-Ohio. This extension of the Virginia Central would have provided a railroad from Richmond to the Ohio running through the center of Virginia. A legislative act of 1860 permitted the issuance of \$3,213,194 in capital stock for the construction of the line. Indeed, so eager was the state to see this stretch completed that it seemed willing to provide all the necessary capital, following the precedent which had been set in building the Blue Ridge Railroad with state funds in the 1850's.¹⁹ Only \$1,275,000 of the company's original capital had been spent by 1860 for surveys of the route by Charles B. Fisk and for grading done as far as White Sulphur Springs. After 1861 the state was less liberal in granting funds for this project, though the rails for the new section had been received from abroad.²⁰ Numerous reasons were advanced by Governor John Letcher, Charles Fisk, and others for the completion of the Covington-Ohio, but the attention of the state was diverted toward prosecution of the war. The advocates of extension argued that the line would afford greater protection along the border, provide better means of troop transportation, and form an iron band across the whole state which would supplement boat navigation on the Kanawha.²¹

Only some \$50,000 was expended on the Covington-Ohio in 1861.²² Bills continued to be introduced in the legislature for new appropriations, for, as one member stated, Virginia bonds were selling at par and six thousand persons would be employed if work continued on this stretch. The bills were not passed, however, and work on the line was suspended. Interest in the Covington-Ohio remained high, however, and in 1862 William A. Kuper was retained to make a survey over the

¹⁹ This company was chartered by legislative act in 1853, and the building of the road was completed in 1857.

²⁰ See *Railway Age* (Chicago, 1870-), CIII (1937), 620. The rails were destined never to be placed on the Covington-Ohio, but were used to replace old rails in other sections of the line.

²¹ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works, 1860-1861*, pp. 18-23; *Annual Report of the Virginia Central Railroad, 1861*, p. 13.

²² *Journal of the Board of Public Works* (MS. in office of State Corporation Commission, Richmond), Book N, 1861, pp. 29, 35.

territory between Covington and White Sulphur Springs by way of Jerry's Run. He estimated the cost of the completion of this section at \$520,000 and the time necessary for the work at fifteen months. A recommendation was made that Irish and convict labor be used.²³ In 1863 only \$2,500 was spent on the Covington-Ohio and in the following year a bill providing for further appropriation was rejected.²⁴ With the conclusion of the war an act reincorporated the company according to the law of 1860.²⁵ In addition, the president and directors were authorized to borrow for construction, and it was provided that if no private company would undertake the task of building, the state might build its own line. The Virginia Central was interested, however, and the state was glad to have the construction handled by a private company.²⁶

Extensions effecting consolidation of Virginia rail lines had been delayed too long. Each railroad feared that the others would reap undue profit as a result of providing connecting links. When the war came the scarcity of labor and material afforded excuses for delayed action on this matter. The Confederacy urged the companies to consolidate, both in order to offset these shortages and as a patriotic duty. In answer to this plea, in May, 1862, the Virginia Central and the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac companies provided a connecting link between their respective lines in Richmond after the city council very tardily had granted them the right-of-way.²⁷ This particular delay therefore could not be blamed entirely on the companies. Editorials called for other consolidations, and pleaded that each line stop treating the other as "a foreigner." Connections between the Virginia Central, the Virginia-Tennessee, and the Southside were cited as necessary. Such an arrangement would be highly advantageous, because the various lines

²³ *Ibid.*, Book N, 1861, pp. 8, 9, 28; Richmond *Daily Dispatch*, February 5, 1861; Richmond *Whig*, February 2, 1862.

²⁴ Journal of the Board of Public Works, Book N, 1863, p. 422; Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, February 6, 1864.

²⁵ This act had provided that a new company be created with \$3,000,000 capitalization for the building of the Covington-Ohio.

²⁶ *Acts of the General Assembly of Virginia*, 1865-1866, p. 317.

²⁷ Richmond *Daily Dispatch*, May 18, 1862.

could interchange cars, establish uniform tolls, and use common express depots.²⁸ This defect delayed through traffic and caused an extra amount of reloading which contributed largely to the complete breakdown of the Confederate transportation system.

Maintenance, consolidation, and extension were not the only major problems which confronted the railroads the Confederacy. During the war problems of finance became increasingly serious. Practically all of the southern lines had opened with inadequate original capital outlays which were augmented only when new extensions were permitted. The Virginia Central was no exception to this pattern. The capital of the company was increased for one extension only, even though expenses resulting from war ravages and from scarcities already mentioned cut deeply into the original capital. Payment for services in depreciated currency added to the difficulty. Though the Virginia Central had been paying off its debt prior to 1861, new loans were contracted later and the line found itself hard pressed to pay the interest. The receipts were largely in inflated currency or in government bonds, while expenses were mounting annually. Dividends of four and one-half per cent or less were paid semi-annually, although they might have been employed to replace the capital expended or applied to reduce the rapidly accumulating debt.²⁹ After viewing this sorry financial condition, Fontaine declared in 1864 that "The result has vindicated at least one of the railroad companies of the Confederacy from the charge of growing rich since the commencement of the war, by the extravagant charges. A fair and unprejudiced investigation of the subject will show that the stockholders of the railroad companies generally, are probably the only persons in the Confederacy whose capital has not been productive since the war commenced."³⁰

At the beginning of the war, the state owned \$1,960,382 and private

²⁸ Richmond *Daily Enquirer*, September 16, 1864.

²⁹ From 1861 to 1865 dividends were paid as follows: June, 1861, none; November, 1861, 3 per cent; March, 1862, 4½ per cent (in Confederate bonds); September, 1862, 2½ per cent; March, 1863, 3½ per cent; September, 1863, 3½ per cent; September, 1864 (for the entire year), 3 per cent; and in 1865, none.

³⁰ Annual Report to the Stockholders of the Virginia Central Railroad (MS. in office of Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad Company), 1864, p. 15.

stockholders owned \$1,352,000 of the total capitalization of the Virginia Central.³¹ By 1865 the state was anxious to sell its shares of stock to the highest bidder, for reasons which were quite evident. The line's debt to the state increased from \$30,000 to \$300,000 during the war, which was a huge increase when the company's floating debt of \$40,929 jumped to \$1,499,500 at the same time. The total debt equaled \$1,637,118 in 1865, but the treasury had only one hundred dollars in gold to meet it.³² A legislative act of 1866 allowed the road to issue \$300,000 of coupon bonds payable in ten years.³³ This debt was paid off slowly in the 1870's.

With increased yearly receipts, the company appeared to have been making larger profits. The extra sums accruing here were consumed, however, by increased expenditures resulting from war damages, repair, labor, equipment costs, and extra war service performed at lower rates. Of the \$656,406 gross receipts in 1861, forty-two per cent went for current expenses. The first figure included \$7,792 for carrying the mail and \$275,481 for hauling men and supplies for the Confederacy. In 1863, though the gross receipts had increased fifty per cent, the expenses had advanced one hundred per cent.³⁴ The following year, Fontaine recognized the situation in his annual report to the stockholders when he said: "It cannot be doubted that the cost of operating a railroad during the past year has been ten times as great as it was in 1860. The expenses in that year were \$274,954; the expenditures in the past year were \$2,212,128 or eight and one-half times. The repairs of the Road and its machines are not, and cannot, be kept as they should be; and the company is actually expending its capital, for this accumulated depreciation must be met at some future day."³⁵ A net profit of \$7.17 in United States currency was realized in 1865. This condition soon

³¹ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1862, p. 42.

³² *Ibid.*, 1861, p. 96; 1862, p. 42; 1867, p. 67; *Acts of the General Assembly of Virginia*, 1865, p. 337; *Journal of the Board of Public Works*, Book N, 1861, p. 7.

³³ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1866, p. 94.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1862, p. 62; *Annual Report to the Stockholders*, 1861, p. 20; 1862, p. 9; 1863, pp. 10, 17.

³⁵ *Annual Report to the Stockholders*, 1864, pp. 26-27.

changed, as is shown by the financial report of 1866,³⁶ and recovery was rapid in the immediate postwar years.

Expenses included such items as tolls owed the state for using the Blue Ridge tunnels, which the company had not entirely paid for;³⁷ the cost of converting certain cars into troop trains; the expense of repairing other lines' locomotives, and of meeting the raises in officials' salaries, which tripled from 1861 to 1865. Additional expenses were the charges for equipment and ordinary supplies, which mounted yearly in the devalued currency, as the table below indicates.³⁸

Further losses were sustained by the Virginia Central in the acceptance of Confederate bonds in payment for services performed. In 1863 Confederate bonds totalling \$53,000 were accepted, and later \$201,000 in coupon bonds, based on cotton owned by the Confederacy, were purchased. These bonds were to be redeemed as soon as the government could ship the cotton abroad for sale, but when the bonds proved worthless the company was unable to collect the largest portion of its earnings from the Confederacy.³⁹ Fontaine explained the wretched condition of finance in the following sane and frank statement:

³⁶ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1866, p. 101, shows the following earnings and expenses for the fiscal year: Earnings—passenger fares, \$247,625; for freight, \$196,134; express, \$26,336; mail, \$15,238; miscellaneous, \$985; total, \$486,319. Expenses—transportation, \$149,415; repairs of trains, \$53,235; repairs of workshop, \$2,500; repairs of railroad, \$127,343; salaries, \$12,016; taxes, \$20,552; real estate, \$177; insurance, \$2,071; total, \$367,313.

³⁷ Miscellaneous papers in Virginia Central Railroad document box (Office of the State Corporation Commission). Often these are mere scraps of paper with notations thereon.

³⁸ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1864, pp. 26-27, presents the following table of comparative costs for 1860 and 1864:

	1860 United States Currency	1864 Confederate Currency
Clothing and subsistence of negroes.....	\$60.00	\$1,870.00
Iron castings and wrought iron, per pound.....	.04	1.00
Brass castings.....	.34	4.50
Car wheels, each.....	15.00	500.00
Oil and tallow, per gallon.....	.90	50.00
Coal for shops, per bushel.....	.12	2.00
Lumber per M.....	12.50	100.00
Shovels, per dozen.....	10.50	300.00
Wages of mechanics, per day.....	1.75	11.00

³⁹ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1863, p. 82; Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1863, p. 17; 1865, p. 40.

It is proper to state that repeated but unsuccessful efforts were made, to collect the amount in notes, or to adjust those balances by taking gold at a ratiable proportion, according to the market value of Confederate paper. Our losses as stated before are only such as befall almost everyone else, and whilst there is no pleasure in referring to the misfortunes of others, we may be better able to hear our own, when we know that ours is a common lot. The Board cannot help but feel some satisfaction from the fact that all the investments which they have made, were fully stated in the last report, and having passed the ordeal of our examining committee without objection, and of the stockholders in general meeting, many of whom are thorough business men, they thought themselves well fortified in the propriety of this course. It turned out, however, that we were all mistaken. Let us not repine, but submitting patiently to the unforeseen and calamitous results which have befallen the country, as it is our duty to do, without any vain murmurs, let us gird ourselves with fresh resolution to meet any difficulties which may be in our path, and try to overcome them, as we have done many others, that were very formidable in our past history.⁴⁰

During the war the equipment of the road depreciated seriously. This can be clearly seen in the first report of Superintendent Whitcomb, who stated:

In comparing the expenses of this with the previous year, the increased weight and number of trains must be kept in mind, also, the largely increased price of every article that is used in repairs, or on the trains. It is a fair estimate to put the increase in the price of labor, materials and supplies at twenty-five per cent more during the last quarter of the year than for the preceding three quarters of the year. The locomotives are constantly used with loads to the extent of their capacity, and cannot be spared repairs; they are run until they can run no longer. Many of them are old, and constantly out of order. The freight cars, also, have been in constant use. The supply of cars being limited, makes it necessary to run them without repairs as long as it is safe to do so. They have been seriously damaged in the transportation of troops and considerable expense is necessary to put them in good order.⁴¹

Fortunately, the president was able to secure a supply of iron before the blockade, and this was used to replace old, worn-out materials.⁴² In 1862 the company was able to purchase a supply of "T" rails for

⁴⁰ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1865, pp. 17-18.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 1861, p. 29. The equipment of which Whitcomb spoke consisted of 8 engine houses, 27 engines, 15 first-class cars, 8 second-class cars, 8 baggage cars, and 210 freight cars. *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1861, p. 103.

⁴² Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1861, p. 13.

which old rails were exchanged in part payment.⁴³ As the war ravages took heavier toll, the railroad found it harder and harder to replace the links destroyed. Finally, Major General Jeremy F. Gilmer, C.S.A., ordered the line west of Goshen Station to be dismantled for use elsewhere. From that time until the end of the war, the railroad line was intact only in spots.⁴⁴

The superstructure suffered constantly from wear and burning. Because of scarcities of labor and materials, the company found it almost impossible to secure the ties necessary for replacement. Though the railroad tried to supply itself with wagons, teams, and sawmills, there were never enough ties. Therefore, the board of directors, recognizing the necessity for wood and crossties for the road, authorized the president on August 4, 1863, to purchase land to enable him to get timber, and the Confederate government was requested to assist the road in meeting this problem.⁴⁵ In response to this request, the Confederacy in 1864 detached a number of men in service on condition that they would contract with the Virginia Central to furnish wood and ties.⁴⁶

The record as to rolling stock was slightly better. The company was able to purchase from the Confederacy three locomotives which had been captured from Federal forces early in the war. Two of these locomotives replaced two which had exploded. All the locomotives were in constant need of repair with chilled tires, axles, and new cabs. At the close of the war the twenty-four locomotives still in use were in need of overhauling, and some had to be retired.⁴⁷ Losses of cars were frequent after the first battle of Manassas; more than twenty cars were lost in the retreats from Manassas and Winchester in 1861.⁴⁸ Cars were taken for use on other roads to such an extent that the board of directors resolved on January 27, 1862, "that the president and superin-

⁴³ *Richmond Daily Dispatch*, April 29, 1862.

⁴⁴ Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, December 14, 1864.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, August 4, 1863.

⁴⁶ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1864, p. 12.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 1861, p. 30; 1862, p. 27; 1863, p. 26; 1865, p. 43.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 1862, pp. 26-27.

tendent take such steps as they may deem best to secure the return of our cars when taken off the road and in the event of not being able to effect that object otherwise they are authorized to prevent the cars being taken from the road.”⁴⁹ Additions of box and gondola cars were made from time to time to replace those burned by the enemy. By 1865 the destruction of these was faster than the shops could produce new or recondition old ones. In 1866 the rolling stock of the road consisted of 29 engines, 12 first-class cars, 3 second-class cars, 42 express cars, and 159 freight cars. All of this equipment was in serious need of repair.⁵⁰ Even the stationary equipment was destroyed again and again. Many bridges were destroyed and replaced a number of times, and many depots, with their stores of war materials and equipment, including telegraph apparatus, suffered a similar fate.

That the South still relied on the foreign markets for manufactured goods was clearly revealed when, in 1863, the Virginia Central employed Moncure Robinson, then on a trip to London for the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad Company, to contract for iron. In payment the London dealers received the bonds of the company. About one-fourth of the supplies which Robinson purchased were captured en route from London by the Federal navy; the remainder was unloaded at Bermuda.⁵¹

The equipment problem, therefore, played no small part in limiting the services rendered by the road. Doubt often was expressed whether the equipment would hold out. As early as 1862 President Fontaine said:

Much anxiety is felt to know whether our railroads can be kept in safe running order if the war shall continue a few years longer, and it is hardly to be doubted that the rapid decline in the efficiency of our roads is soon to diminish our means of successfully maintaining our struggle for independence; but that the ground of hope for effecting our subjugation, like many others, will fail them. If the speed of our trains is judiciously reduced, with reference to the depreciation of

⁴⁹ Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, January 27, 1862.

⁵⁰ List in Virginia Central Railroad document box (Office of State Corporation Commission).

⁵¹ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1863, p. 10; 1864, p. 16.

the rails, our roads will last many years longer. In conformity with these views, the speed of our trains has been much lessened, and, if necessary, will be to a greater extent.⁵²

Their stock in need of repair, their roadbeds, ties, and rails inadequate and their crews reduced by the war, less and less service could be expected from the railroads as the war dragged on, and regular schedules were seldom followed. In the summer of 1861 the main mail train left Richmond for points west at 6:15 A.M. By 1863, two trains, one added especially to carry troops, left the same place at 7:00 A.M. and at 2:30 P.M. to go as far west as possible. The schedule of 1865 quoted trains as leaving Richmond at 6:45 A.M. for Staunton and returning at 7:15 P.M. As early as July, 1862, operations were temporarily suspended until the Confederate Secretary of War had assured the company protection above Gordonsville. By the following year the route west of Charlottesville was reopened, only to have the enemy begin systematic destruction of sections of track and bridges so that schedules were rarely kept.⁵³

It was frequently necessary to adjust the rates charged for both passengers and freight during the war period. The first question which arose was the amount which the railroads were to receive for hauling troops and supplies. To answer this question a railroad convention was held in Richmond in early summer, 1861, at which the following resolutions were agreed upon: (1) Troops would be transported at two cents per mile while munitions, provisions, and materials would be carried at half the regular freight rates (the regular rates on the Virginia Central were three and one-half cents a passenger mile and two and one-half cents a ton mile); (2) Bonds would be accepted at par value from the Confederate treasurer in payment for the above and for carrying the mails; (3) The above business would be given preference over the regular trade; and (4) The returning empty cars might pick up freight

⁵² *Ibid.*, 1862, p. 11.

⁵³ Richmond *Whig*, June 6, 1861, July 24, 1865; Richmond *Sentinel*, September 16, 1864; Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Directors, September 26, 1861, and July 23, 1862; Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1865, p. 41.

on their return.⁵⁴ In reporting these resolutions to the Virginia Central stockholders, President Fontaine explained that the reduction of charges involved quite a large sacrifice, but that the patriotism of the stockholders would justify them in their efforts to sustain the government in its present struggle for independence.⁵⁵

In 1861 the Virginia Central carried 166,235 passengers a total of 108,534 miles; 50,393 tons of freight were shipped in its freight trains; and troop trains ran a total of 18,557 miles.⁵⁶ The troops were carried without prepayment, but all employees of the Confederate government were required to present their credentials. The freight carried included 982 kegs of powder and 3,819 barrels of whiskey.⁵⁷ The next year, when the rates had increased only slightly over 1861, business was practically the same. The customers complained of the need for more supplies, such as corn, potatoes, butter, eggs, and a variety of other articles which were available in the rural areas,⁵⁸ and Richmond called for fuel supplies. A specific act was passed by the legislature ordering the governor to take control of the roads if necessary. The Virginia Central declared that the legislature had no idea of the ability of the lines to furnish fuel. Furthermore, Superintendent Whitcomb informed the Board of Public Works that thirteen cars would be required to haul the 10,000 cords of wood wanted in Richmond, and that these same cars were needed for ambulances and for the carriage of lumber for hospitals. The 10,000 cords were not secured.⁵⁹

There was an increase only in tonnage for 1863, but fares were up to five and five-eighths cents per passenger mile, and freight rates varied from nine cents per ton mile for government material to twenty-five cents on dry goods for private customers.⁶⁰ With the depreciation

⁵⁴ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1861, p. 90.

⁵⁵ *Annual Report to the Stockholders*, 1861, p. 12.

⁵⁶ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1861, p. 103.

⁵⁷ *Richmond Daily Enquirer*, July 23, 1861.

⁵⁸ *Richmond Daily Examiner*, November 14, 1862.

⁵⁹ Henry D. Whitcomb to Board of Public Works, November 7, 1862, in Virginia Central Railroad document box (Office of State Corporation Commission).

⁶⁰ *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1863, p. 67.

in the value of Confederate currency in 1864, big increases were made in the rates on July 11, 1864, and February 24, 1865. Superintendent Whitcomb explained:

The rates for passengers have been very low when compared with the prices paid for nearly every article which contributed to the expenses. As complaints have been made in some quarters of the rates now charged by Railroad Companies, it's proper to make some statements on the subject.

Rate for first class passengers per mile	22¢
Rate for government passengers per mile	10¢
Rate per 100 pounds for public	4.00
Rate per 100 pounds for government	.901½¢

The present rate of fare for citizens is about five times and the rates for freight about ten times the prices of 1860; but as two-thirds of the passengers are on government account, and seven-eighths of the freight is government freight, the present average charge is less than three times the old rate for passengers and five times the old charges for freight.⁶¹

Despite this explanation, complaints continued to be made. A contributor to the *Richmond Sentinel* declared that in 1860 the Virginia Central had charged only four and five cents per mile for passenger fares and six and eight cents per ton mile on freight; now the charges were twenty to twenty-five cents per mile for passengers, and sixty to eighty cents per ton mile for freight. The monthly expenses of the road were only \$23,000, and little repair work was being done, with dividends still being paid. The writer demanded a court investigation to force the use of dividends for repairs.⁶² The president and superintendent promptly answered these charges by saying that such rate increases were necessary and that although the revenues had increased through 1863, the tonnage was only one-ninth larger than in 1860. Furthermore, they contended, the government was charging increasing amounts for provisions; there had been increases of approximately sixty to eighty per cent for clothing, thirty to forty per cent for shoes, and fifty per cent for steel. If the line expended its surplus for upkeep, its expenses would soon exceed the revenues. The schedules were held to be ruinous, and the Board of Public Works was asked for a fifty

⁶¹ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1864, p. 26.

⁶² *Richmond Sentinel*, December 19, 1864.

per cent increase in freight charges and a forty-five per cent increase in passenger fares.⁶³

The transportation of the mail was paid for by the Confederacy and with one exception it was carried by the Virginia Central as long as the trains ran. When the Confederate government fell in arrears in its payments for postal service in September, 1864, the company refused to carry the mail for a short period, but relations between the postal department and the company were soon clarified.⁶⁴ In the first postwar year, the business was fast approaching that of 1860.⁶⁵

Hampered as it was by lack of rolling stock, financial troubles, and other difficulties, the Virginia Central was nevertheless of enormous value to the Confederate armies. The line bridged a number of Virginia battlefields and crossed the Valley of Virginia out of which came essential supplies for Lee's army. Again and again the Federal troops endeavored to break the iron bands which were proving so necessary in transporting Confederate troops east and west. General Fitz-John Porter, commander of the Federals in the Peninsula campaign, termed the Virginia Central as "the one great line of the enemy's communication between Richmond and Northern Virginia."⁶⁶ As early as April 15, 1861, President Fontaine agreed, at the request of Governor John Letcher, to put on the necessary trains for troop movements. Troop trains then began moving from Richmond to Gordonsville, Charlottesville, Staunton, and return.

Federal troops first damaged the road on May 17, 1861, when they took possession of the Jackson's River depot and a detachment of cavalry burned the Cowpasture bridge. Of more serious consequence was their seizure of two stations at Atlee and Hanover, which remained

⁶³ Papers in Virginia Central Railroad document box (Office of State Corporation Commission).

⁶⁴ *Richmond Daily Dispatch*, September 2, 1864; *Richmond Daily Enquirer*, September 6, 1864, November 15, 1865.

⁶⁵ *Documents of the General Assembly of Virginia, 1865-1866*, pp. 89-94; *Annual Report of the Board of Public Works*, 1866, p. 103.

⁶⁶ G. Watson James, Jr., "Virginia Central Railroad of Great Strategic Importance in the Struggle of '61 to '65," in *Chesapeake and Ohio Railway Employees Magazine* (Richmond, 1914-), VIII (May, 1923), 18. The pages are numbered separately for each issue.

in their hands until June 29. They also burned the trestles of the South Anna bridge near Hanover Court House, and captured a locomotive and seven cars. Repairs were completed on this section by July 18.⁶⁷

In 1862 Stonewall Jackson's men were at Meachum's Station, and were moved to Staunton to defend that area from the Federal forces. General George B. McClellan reported to the War Department of the United States in July that engines and cars in large numbers were being sent to bring up Jackson's men, but that he had destroyed part of the roadbed and the South Anna bridge. General George Stoneman was destroying portions of track between Hanover and Atlee stations at the same time.⁶⁸ When Jackson moved eastward to unite with Lee and oppose McClellan's "On to Richmond" campaign, it was generally believed that Jackson was en route to the Potomac River. Jackson outlined his plans to Superintendent Whitcomb, and warned him that the least expression or intimation made by any employee of the Virginia Central giving rise to suspicions of intended movements would be occasion for summary punishment. Jackson ordered all available cars assembled. They were to run a certain distance, unload, and return to meet troops advancing on foot, then to repeat the process. The movement was a success and contributed vitally to the defeat of McClellan and the saving of Richmond.⁶⁹

Federal units visited Beaver Dam in July, destroying the buildings and stores there. This depot had been built under orders of the Confederate government in 1861 for storing military supplies. In addition, three passenger cars, one hundred freight cars, two fine locomotives, 200,000 pounds of bacon, and other stores amounting to some 1,500,000 pounds, and ten miles of track, were destroyed.⁷⁰ The raiders con-

⁶⁷ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1862, p. 26.

⁶⁸ George B. McClellan to Lorenzo Thomas, July 15, 1862, in *War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies*, 129 vols. and index (Washington, 1880-1901), Ser. I, Vol. XI, Part 2, pp. 19-21. For a fictionalized account of a part of these operations, see Mary Johnston, *The Long Roll* (New York, 1911), 240-42.

⁶⁹ Decatur Axtell, Notes (MS. deposited in office of Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad, Richmond).

⁷⁰ James, "Virginia Central Railroad," *loc. cit.*, 27.

tinued their depredations farther west, causing a \$2,000 damage at Frederick Hall alone.⁷¹ Meanwhile, the company's books and office equipment had been moved from Richmond to Charlottesville.

Troops were needed in northern Virginia in August, 1862, to check the movements of General John Pope, and their transfer necessitated prompt replacement of the bridges between Richmond and Gordonsville which had been destroyed by Federal forces. George R. Thomasson, the veteran Virginia bridge builder, with a force of laborers, a good engine, twenty flat cars, and a supply of timber which he might requisition along the way, tried to complete the job in time. Despite controversies over requisitions and the loss of some of his slave labor, Thomasson succeeded,⁷² and eighteen trains of fifteen cars each were soon carrying Jackson's men west to Gordonsville over the repaired bridges. "Pull up and return" for ten days were the orders to be carried out by each engineer. On one occasion several cars broke down, and the soldiers refused to get out, whereupon the cars were left behind with the soldiers inside. Again, due to the failure to signal, trains often came near colliding.⁷³ The services of Superintendent Whitcomb proved to be so valuable in this campaign that when he resigned in 1863 Lee made the position of superintendent a military necessity and gave him a commission as major. Lee gave instructions that Whitcomb's orders be posted in all train cabs and that no officers interfere with his management.⁷⁴

In summarizing the ravages of war on the line for 1862, President Fontaine's report appears somewhat too mild. "During the past summer a portion of the road between Hanover Court House and Richmond was in the hands of the enemy," he said. "They did no great injury either to the road way or any other property of the company, except the burning of the South Anna bridge, a few miles were torn up in several places and two pieces of trestle work and a few cars were burnt."⁷⁵

⁷¹ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1862, p. 26; *Richmond Daily Dispatch*, August 8, 1862.

⁷² Anderson, "Train Running with the Confederacy," *loc. cit.*, V (1892), 177.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, VI (1893), 207.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, X (1897), 677.

⁷⁵ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1862, p. 32.

Federal troops raided Louisa Court House on May 1, 1863, and train service east of Gordonsville was discontinued until the eighth. The bridges east of Taylorsville were burned, and the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad tracks had to be used until July 25. The Hanover depot and several cars of military stores were burned in a raid by Stoneman's forces.⁷⁶ All the while Lee's supply line, the Virginia Central, was close to a complete breakdown, for when the company handled troops it was unable to deliver provisions or forage. Tracks were as bad as the equipment, for no new rails could be found in the Confederacy to replace the old ones. Lee urged the Virginia Central to keep up its line and unload the trains promptly; he even ordered out his forces to help repair the line near Richmond.⁷⁷

Fontaine reported before the annual meeting of stockholders on November 26, 1863, that though receipts had increased by fifty per cent, expenses had increased twice that amount because of the difficulties in securing metal, lumber, and labor for building cars. He continued:

The frequent raids made by the enemy on the road and its close proximity to the country actually occupied by them, has produced some hesitation with the owners of slaves in hiring them to the company; and large numbers from the section of country supplying us with hands have either run off to the enemy or been carried off by them. Previous to the war, the large amount of fuel for locomotives and cross-ties for the track were furnished by contractors; and now the labor formerly employed in that was so much diminished . . . so many of the horses and mules used for hauling have been taken by the government; in many cases, too, they have been seized by our enemy, and so many of the contractors are subject to military duty that we are, to a great extent, entirely dependent on our own resources for procuring wood and ties. For this purpose the company has been compelled to resort to the unusual means of purchasing wagons, teams, hands and steam saw-mills. The existence of the extra-ordinary embarrassments above mentioned have commenced in this past year, at one time serious apprehensions were felt lest the road and machinery could not be kept in a condition to perform the amount of transportation required for public service.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 1863, pp. 24-25.

⁷⁷ Douglas S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee: A Biography*, 4 vols. (New York, 1936), III, 248.

⁷⁸ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1863, pp. 9-10.

The Virginia Central was hard pressed now; even the Secretary of War of the Confederacy, in his report in January, 1864, acknowledged the seriousness of the situation, declaring that the army was impeded by the inadequacy of the railroad lines. Generally, he declared, the lines had been handled in a patriotic spirit; a mere threat of taking them over was enough to keep them operating, and the government had regularly been given preference.⁷⁹

There were countless raids on the Virginia Central during 1864. It was said of General Grant that he cut the roadbed in sound of the train whistles, but he seemed unable to hold the tracks of rust.⁸⁰ There were first the raids of General Hugh J. Kilpatrick and Colonel Ulric Dahlgren in February, one crossing at Frederick Hall, the other at Beaver Dam. At the latter place the buildings were destroyed again. Both pushed toward Richmond where the laborers of the Tredegar Iron Works, the armories, and the railroads were out to defend the city. On May 9 General Philip H. Sheridan joined the Richmond advance, and upon reaching Beaver Dam destroyed recently deposited stores. Several trains were surprised, two engines were disabled, and twenty-nine cars were burned. In addition, the bridge over the Chickahominy was destroyed. By May 14 the track was repaired, and trains again made the trip over the line. Sheridan was opposed by Wade Hampton at Trevelians, where great charges were made back and forth across the railway roadbed. Sheridan's plans were to cut the line there and at Lindsay, but Hampton defeated him and delayed this action.⁸¹ General George G. Meade wrote after this engagement that "until that road [Virginia Central] is destroyed, we cannot compel the evacuation of Richmond."⁸² General Grant's army seized the line between Anderson's and Hewlett's, and four and one-half miles of track were destroyed.⁸³ At the western end of the line, forces under General David Hunter destroyed the station buildings at Staunton and at Fishersville. East of

⁷⁹ Richmond *Sentinel*, January 14, 1864.

⁸⁰ James, "Virginia Central Railroad," *loc. cit.*, 25.

⁸¹ Anderson, "Train Running with the Confederacy," *loc. cit.*, X (1897), 912.

⁸² Freeman, *Lee*, III, 361.

⁸³ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1864, p. 12.

these points more than a half dozen miles of rails and twelve bridges were destroyed.⁸⁴ Repairs were made continuously. By September Sheridan had reached Staunton and Waynesboro where property was burned, bridge spans destroyed, and track taken up. So thorough was his destruction that the stone viaducts and the turntable at Staunton did not escape.⁸⁵ Superintendent Whitcomb, in reporting the year's damages, stated:

In several raids the enemy has burned seven water stations, four passenger houses, one engine house, eighteen bridges of over thirty feet span, and many smaller ones; tore up and burned over eighteen miles of track, three turntables, thirty-six cars, 20,000 cross-ties, and a large amount of wood, besides other damages which will not be particularized. The enemy has been at every station between Gordonsville and Richmond, except Hanover Junction and every station west of the Blue Ridge. The loss of revenue to the company was large, but I believe the army suffered little or no inconvenience, and as this was the great object of the enemy, his operation may be considered a failure.⁸⁶

He stated, too, that many of the buildings would have to be rebuilt after the war. The fact that during the year 188,342 troops traveled 2,216 miles by troop trains and 616 by ambulance trains, indicates that the Virginia Central Railroad was not only performing its patriotic duty, but was doing a remarkable job with fewer than thirty engines and two hundred cars.⁸⁷

The railroad was still operating in 1865 and using practically its whole mileage. In March General Sheridan had forced General Jubal A. Early to retreat to a point near Waynesboro. It was evident that if this retreat continued Sheridan might get beyond Rockfish Gap to threaten Lee's rear, the source of his supplies. In order to prevent this, Early prepared to give battle at Waynesboro, holding his supplies at Greenwood Station.⁸⁸ After Early's defeat, the Federal army destroyed the bridges from Staunton to Keswick, a distance of forty-six miles, burned the station houses except those in Charlottesville, and damaged the track to a limited extent. Farther down the track, the station houses,

⁸⁴ James, "Virginia Central Railroad," *loc. cit.*, 30.

⁸⁵ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1864, p. 28.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 43.

⁸⁸ Anderson, "Train Running with the Confederacy," *loc. cit.*, VII (1894), 531.

passenger houses, and eleven miles of track were destroyed. The South Anna bridge was destroyed for the fifth time. Again, as soon as the army had left the road, the company began to repair the damage, and by April 1 about three miles of track had been repaired and trains were able to pass over the South Anna bridge. Further work of restoration was then stopped.⁸⁹

Following the surrender, General Edward O. C. Ord on April 19 gave permission to the company to repair the road and run the trains, though the treasury of the company was virtually empty and the labor on the road was disorganized. Finally, the job of procuring crossties and the rebuilding of the Little River bridge began, and the road was opened to Bumpass Station by April 22 and to the Rivanna River, seventy miles from Richmond, by May 22. Meanwhile, the repairs from Staunton eastward had commenced, and a train was run between that point and Meachum's Station. An arrangement was made to run a tri-weekly line of horse cars between Moore's Creek and Meachum's for passengers and freight. It was the only section of the road yet to be restored to regular service. This arrangement added considerably to the revenues of the company.⁹⁰ Passenger service over the entire line was resumed on July 23, 1865.

Although every mile of its lines lay in the battle zone, and although it suffered greatly from loss of rolling stock, the Virginia Central Railroad, under its own officials and without coming under the control of the Confederate government, rendered great service to the Confederate cause. Beset by inflation, depreciation, and inadequate labor force, it nevertheless served as an important artery for Lee's army until Appomattox, and it was a strong factor in the success of the delaying actions of the Confederate forces in Virginia.

⁸⁹ Annual Report to the Stockholders, 1865, p. 41.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 41-42.

The Problem of Credit Rating in the Ante-Bellum South

BY LEWIS E. ATHERTON

Business records of country and interior storekeepers in the Old South demonstrate that at least two-thirds to three-fourths of all merchandise purchased by farmers was obtained on credit.¹ Stores followed a common policy of collecting accounts once a year, January 1 being the generally accepted date of settlement. The final accounting frequently was delayed until early spring, however, which meant that farmers often received as much as twelve months' time on a large part of their annual purchases. Storekeepers in turn bought much of their merchandise on credit in eastern cities. The value of goods obtained by the South in 1859 from New York City alone, for example, has been estimated at \$131,000,000.² A number of factors attracted southern merchants to eastern markets, but none was more important than the generous and long-term credit available there. As late as the Civil War merchandise was sold to country stores on a credit of six months without interest, and an additional six months was allowed if storekeepers were willing to pay a moderate rate of interest for the extension. Many availed themselves of the privilege, in turn crediting their customers for the same length of time.³ Reduced to its simplest terms, this meant that

¹ A Guggenheim Fellowship and additional assistance from the University of Missouri Research Council made possible the collection of material for this article.

² Stephen Colwell, *The Five Cotton States and New York* (New York, 1861), 23, cited in Philip S. Foner, *Business and Slavery: The New York Merchants and the Irrepressible Conflict* (Chapel Hill, 1941), 7.

³ Credit policies on the eve of the Civil War are clearly reflected in the following letters: Estes, Randolph and Company of Montezuma, Tennessee, to Scheffen and Roberts of Philadelphia, February 6, 1861; McEwen and Hornsby of Kingston, Tennessee, to R. Ashurst and Sons of Philadelphia, March 20, 1861; and Taylor and McEwen of Memphis to R. Ashurst and Sons, May 15, 1861. These three letters are filed together in an unmarked and unclassified folder in the Tennessee State Library, Nashville.

eastern wholesalers provided a large part of the credit on which southern farmers operated by advancing dry goods, hardware, books, medicines, and other needs for a sufficiently long period of time to enable the farmer to harvest his crop and transmit payments through the rural merchant, who acted as middleman between the farmer and the wholesaler.

This credit system strongly influenced southern economy. Extreme conservatism in extending credit tended to restrict crop production and undue generosity created an unhealthy expansion leading to an ultimate collapse with great losses. Reliable methods of credit rating could have reduced the danger of these extremes, but advances in this field came slowly in the ante-bellum period. Failure to realize how much some improvements could contribute undoubtedly retarded changes for the better, but much of the blame must be attributed to the difficulties to be surmounted. Since storekeepers from all parts of the country visited eastern markets, the problem of credit rating was a national one. Railroads and the telegraph still served only a limited part of the country in 1860, thus making it difficult to obtain rapid reports for the national market as a whole. The longer periods for which mercantile credit was granted in the ante-bellum period also prevented rapid adjustments to changing conditions in the general economic picture and a consequent revaluation of the margin of safety in individual cases.

While some experimentation was in evidence before the panic of 1837 vividly illustrated the dangers inherent in the prevailing system of credit, little change in methods of credit rating took place in the early years of the nineteenth century. At the opening of the period, storekeepers and lawyers were the chief sources of information for rating credit applicants. For instance, in 1806, Robert Whyte, a Nashville, Tennessee, lawyer, collected accounts for Philadelphia wholesalers and was also called upon by these men for information on particular storekeepers. Nashville business men who visited Philadelphia to buy goods were also interrogated. Wilson Hunt, of Philadelphia, wrote to Whyte in 1806 concerning a firm which had failed to pay its wholesale bill,

and included information on the case which he had obtained from a number of Nashville merchants then visiting Philadelphia.⁴

Eastern wholesalers advertised their willingness to accept new customers who could bring "respectable letters" from business and professional men in their own communities.⁵ Country storekeepers naturally hesitated to write recommendations for doubtful applicants, since their own chances for obtaining liberal treatment would be injured by such action, and even retired merchants prided themselves too much on their business judgment and word of honor to endorse applicants indiscriminately for eastern credit. For example, when a wealthy, retired storekeeper of Scotland Neck, North Carolina, visited the back country in 1819 on a vacation trip with his family, he was importuned wherever he went to write recommendations for men who wished to buy eastern goods. He obviously was flattered by the compliment to his standing with wholesalers, but his pleasure did not prevent his giving frank appraisals or admitting ignorance of the actual worth of some of the men who had asked him to approve their standing.⁶

Lawyers also seem generally to have been careful in endorsing storekeepers who asked them for letters of recommendation. The collection of wholesale accounts from country storekeepers constituted a lucrative business which appealed even to established men, and some legal firms devoted their major attention to such business. The prospect of sharing in this field of activity, if nothing else, prompted lawyers to advise eastern wholesalers to the best of their ability.

The activities of the Bryan family, lawyers, of New Bern, North Carolina, illustrate the extent to which legal firms engaged in the collection business and in service to their eastern clients. Their corre-

⁴ Wilson Hunt to Robert Whyte, May 23, 1806, in Whyte-Bedford Papers (Tennessee State Library).

⁵ Advertisement of Arthur Tappan and Company, in Huntsville (Ala.) *Southern Advocate*, December 11, 1829; advertisement of Robert Jaffray and Company, *ibid.*, January 1, 1830.

⁶ David Clark to Tredwell and Thorne of New York City, September, 1819, in David Clark and Company Letter Book, 1815-1820, John Hogg Accounts, 1795-1867 (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina). In this letter Clark spoke of having written concerning the requests on September 3, and discussed all the back-country merchants who had asked him for recommendations.

spondence shows that they received a five per cent commission on routine collections and more in difficult cases, the volume of business which came to them providing an excellent income. Wholesalers did not hesitate to ask them to investigate doubtful customers, apparently without pay, since they received whatever legal business developed in the process of collection. The Bryans often examined the standing of storekeepers in their own community without the latter being aware of their activity. Suits were instituted when necessary, but they frequently recommended that legal action be delayed. Their ability, and the reliable nature of their reports, led eastern clients to recommend them to others in need of similar service, and also to accept without question their recommendations concerning credit applications from new customers.⁷

The allocation of widespread and generous credit by eastern wholesalers militated against the success of any scheme of credit rating. None the less, existing methods of judging mercantile standing permitted far too many doubtful cases to acquire respectable financial and personal ratings. Letters of recommendation apparently were too often available to such applicants if they proved insistent. A Mobile, Alabama, paper called attention in 1833 to a particularly flagrant example by devoting a half column on its front page to an article describing certain business activities of J. T. K. Walton, of Montgomery, Alabama, which had originally appeared in the *New York Courier and Enquirer* some three weeks before. The day before the article was first published several New York dealers in dry goods, hardware, crockery, and other merchandise had received the following letter from Walton, dated Montgomery, December 15, 1832:

Gentlemen:—This will apprise you that I have sold out my stock of Goods, and am now settling up my business.

⁷ Leggett, Fox and Company of New York City to John H. Bryan, March 4, 8, 12, 21, 1831, March 13, 1832; Bowen and Jones of New York City to Bryan, June 9, July 17, 1835, February 25, 1836, in Bryan Papers, 1704-1929 (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina). These letters are cited here as illustrations of the large amount of correspondence in this collection concerning the activities of three lawyer members of the Bryan family—John H., James A., and James W.—in collecting claims for eastern merchants.

First—Whilst in New York, last Spring, I purchased too large a stock, and being unacquainted with the purchase of Goods, I was much imposed upon in their prices.

Secondly—During the Summer, I joined Mr. Hopper in business; He visited New York the past Fall for the purpose of purchasing what Goods we thought necessary to keep up the stock, and to my utter astonishment, we were refused credit by nearly all the Houses I had previously purchased of.

Deserted by my friends and having a large Stock of Goods which were laid in at prices far above their value, I determined to sell out, and make the best I could of the affair, I had to sell the Goods at a large discount on their cost, believing it was the best I could do for my creditors and self.

I have some confidential creditors, and they must be secured and if you had not stopped my credit my friends here would have stuck to me, so that I might have done well.

The case is a settled one. Below you have a statement of what and how much I owe. Now if you relieve me from what I owe you, I will pay you in Notes, at the rate of Thirty cents on the Dollar. Should all my creditors in New York agree to this proposition, consign your demands to an Agent here, which agent may be C. T. Pollard, if you please, and by the first of March I will make the payment.

I have written to all the gentlemen whose names you find in the statement below, of my debts, a copy of the Letter, and hope to have a reply at once, from all concerned.

Respectfully[,] J. T. K. Walton

Gentlemen the amount of my New York debts is about \$30,000. Thirty Thousand Dollars. J. T. K. W.^s

Walton's creditors had immediately turned the letter over to New York City papers for publication, and apparently had asked them to send copies to southern editors. The dealers had also furnished background facts in support of their case. Walton had visited the city for the first time in the preceding April and had brought letters warmly recommending him to New York wholesalers. Visitors from his section of the country had also endorsed his standing. The editor of the *Courier and Enquirer* called attention to a Nashville case of a similar nature, which had occurred during the preceding year, and asserted that business men of that town had compelled the guilty party to make restitution. "Is not the mercantile character of Montgomery now alike

^s Mobile *Commercial Register and Patriot*, January 18, 1833, quoting New York *Courier and Enquirer*, December 29, 1832.

at stake," he asked, "and do not the respectable merchants of that place, owe it to themselves and to their eastern friends to interfere in the present instance?"

The Mobile editor apologized for his delay in printing the article, but said that he had wanted to give Pollard, whom Walton had named as his agent, an opportunity to clear himself. This having been done, the account was published, evidently in order to arouse public opinion on the case. While it is probable that in extreme cases of dishonesty something might be achieved through such methods, most of the cases did not fall in that category. The tremendous rate of bankruptcy which developed in the panic of 1837 demonstrated that dishonesty did not constitute the major problem; accurate knowledge of the financial resources of credit applicants was far more important. Thus one result of the confusion and financial losses occasioned by the panic was the more rapid development of systematic methods of obtaining information for credit rating purposes.

As early as 1827, Sheldon P. Church, operating from New York City, had begun to make credit reports to some of the larger eastern wholesalers on a part-time basis, and two years later Baring Brothers and Company, of London, had employed Thomas W. Ward to act as their agent in the United States to obtain credit information exclusively for their use. Church continued to operate on an informal individualistic basis until 1841, when his clients formed "The Merchants Vigilance Association," and engaged him as their agent to assemble credit information from all parts of the country. In this new capacity he made an extensive tour of the South in 1842, and on the basis of information gained on this and later trips he published anonymously, in 1847, a volume of credit reports in which, for the first time, merchants in all parts of the South received attention.⁹

Another agency, also established in 1841, was to play a more active

⁹ For a convenient sketch of these early activities, see Roy A. Foulke, *The Sinews of American Commerce* (New York, 1941), 360-68. A year before the publication of Church's volume, Washington Hite, an attorney of Bardstown, Kentucky, had published a small volume containing credit information on Kentucky merchants. *Ibid.*, 368-70.

role, however, in the development of the systematic rating of southern stores in the ante-bellum period. This was "The Mercantile Agency" of Lewis Tappan of New York City, a member of the firm of Arthur Tappan and Company. This firm had devoted considerable attention to the financial standing of the customers with whom it dealt, and it had enjoyed a large share of southern trade until the abolitionist activities of the Tappan brothers brought them into disrepute with Southerners.¹⁰ With the temporary suspension of the firm after the panic of 1837 Lewis Tappan retired as an active partner; and on June 1, 1841, he announced to those wholesale merchants of New York City who were engaged in selling to "the country trade" his intention of devoting his full time to the collection and reporting of credit rating information for the country as a whole.

Tappan began the work of his agency by sending a circular to lawyers and others at distant points inviting them to become his correspondents, hoping in this way "to secure in advance, sufficient data regarding the standing of traders in other cities, towns, country hamlets, and trading posts to enable New York City wholesalers to determine what amount of credit, if any, could safely be accorded."¹¹ By 1846, he had established branch offices in Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, and information was being received from more than six hundred correspondents. To assist with the coverage of the southern states he employed Benjamin Douglass, a young man who had been engaged in the mercantile business in Charleston and New Orleans and whose extensive trips in the South to check on the credit of storekeepers with whom he had dealt made him a valuable addition to the staff. In 1847 Douglass was made a partner in the agency, and following the retirement of Lewis Tappan, in 1849, he continued to operate it as a partner of

¹⁰ For an example of the attacks on Arthur Tappan, in which he was accused of maintaining secret agents in New Orleans to create racial disturbances and in which southern merchants were urged not to buy from him, see an item copied from the New Orleans *True American* (date not indicated), in Huntsville (Ala.) *Democrat*, September 9, 1835. This practice on the part of the smaller local papers of copying such articles from the city papers enabled them to attain general circulation in the South.

¹¹ Foulke, *Sinews of American Commerce*, 289.

Arthur Tappan until 1854, when he became the sole owner, and the name was changed to B. Douglass and Company.¹²

It was perhaps because of Douglass' connection with the agency that it was able to hold the leadership in the appraisal of credit conditions in the South throughout the ante-bellum period despite the fact that numerous competitors had appeared in the field before the outbreak of the Civil War. From the beginning of its operations, however, Tappan's agency seems to have maintained reasonably accurate reports and to have won the confidence of the eastern wholesalers. In 1845, for example, the New York firm of Dorr and Chandler, in asking Charles Crommelin, an attorney of Montgomery, Alabama, to collect a claim against a Tuskegee storekeeper, stated that this was being done on the basis of reports of "L. Tappan & Co." which they had always found "*too correct*" to doubt. Although they had been assured by others that in this case the information was not correct, they said, they intended to proceed on the advice from Tappan.¹³ Subsequent events proved that the agency had not been mistaken in its rating of the merchant in question.

During the early stages of their operations, of course, the credit rating agencies lacked sufficient customers to support the employing of full-time local agents to collect the necessary information from the great market area served by eastern cities. One of their most effective methods of meeting this difficulty is revealed in Tappan's correspondence in 1848 and 1849 with the legal firm of Wilson and Dupuy of Providence, Louisiana, and Alonzo Snyder, a lawyer of Richmond, Louisiana. Wilson and Dupuy had apparently been handling reports for Tappan at an earlier time, and in November, 1848, he sent them a printed letter indicating more clearly the nature of the information wanted and the way in which the correspondents would be rewarded. Pointing out that within a short time southern storekeepers would be on their way to the East to purchase spring goods, he explained that he

¹² See *ibid.*, 281-96, for a brief account of the evolution of this agency from these 1841 beginnings into the present-day firm of Dun and Bradstreet.

¹³ Dorr and Chandler to Charles Crommelin, May 7, 1845, in Crommelin Papers (Alabama Department of Archives and History, Montgomery).

wished to have fresh reports on all men whom Wilson and Dupuy had listed in the past, and on any new firms which had opened since their last report. Increased accuracy and promptness of most reports, he said, had caused the agency to grow in the esteem of eastern merchants, and he now had more requests from his clients for names of collecting lawyers in various parts of the country than ever before. Experience had shown that for a report to be of value to wholesalers it must embrace all points which could affect a storekeeper's standing. It was not enough to report a man simply as good or bad. Wholesalers preferred to make up their own minds on that matter. Facts were wanted. Correspondents should list a storekeeper's property, state his personal and business habits, give his character, note any encumbrances, and report what others had to say of his general standing. Tappan suggested that some lawyers found it helpful to keep a book in which they entered information as they collected it between reports. In semi-annual reports every trader in the district should be mentioned, even if no change had occurred in standing, since this would demonstrate to eastern merchants that all storekeepers were constantly under observation.

Intelligence of failures, assignments, and all other changes affecting credit should be sent "*without delay*," including the date and all other pertinent information. Tappan revealed his shrewdness in suggesting that at no time was a creditor so likely to employ an attorney as when he first heard of a failure. If such information reached a wholesaler from the agency first of all, Tappan generally could control the direction of consequent business. Since there were two other agencies in New York City, he said, and some business men patronized more than one, it was only natural that legal work should go to the agency which first reported a bankruptcy. Tappan would refrain from sending inquiries by letter and telegraph unless absolutely necessary, and correspondents should realize the urgency behind such messages when they occasionally did arrive. The printed letter closed with a promise of better times for collecting attorneys who continued to represent the agency. In sparsely settled areas the remuneration would be small for a time, but it would eventually reach important proportions. All com-

munications would be held as confidential; lawyers need have no fear of a breach of confidence.¹⁴

On these printed forms Tappan also frequently added marginal notations or postscripts in ink giving specific instructions or asking direct questions with regard to firms about which rumors were circulating in eastern cities. In one of these, for example, he asked Wilson and Dupuy why their September report had listed Young and Company, of Young's Point, Louisiana, as good for any bill which they might make, and why a still earlier report had credited the firm with doing a good business. He added that he did not think them a good risk, especially Charles Young, who had long been considered insolvent, and he was anxious to know the basis of the good opinion expressed by the local representatives.¹⁵

Just at this time Wilson and Dupuy seem to have decided to withdraw from the work as Tappan's correspondents, and they recommended Alonzo Snyder as their successor. Snyder had already gained some experience in mercantile matters by collecting accounts for New Orleans houses for several years, during which he had displayed considerable ingenuity. He had learned, for example, the art of avoiding long lawsuits in Mississippi courts by attaching slaves of Natchez debtors when the Negroes crossed the river to Concordia, Louisiana, on Christmas leave.¹⁶ The fact that he later became a planter and a judge indicates that he enjoyed the respect of his associates, and his experience with the credit system made him a good man for the work which Tappan wanted performed.

On December 11, 1848, Wilson and Dupuy sent Snyder the letters which they had received from Tappan in recent months and told him that they were recommending his appointment. They explained that the general report should be sent in at once. Louisiana tax assessment rolls were now complete and Snyder would have no trouble in prepar-

¹⁴ Mercantile Agency to Wilson and Dupuy (printed letter with additions in ink), November 13, 1848, in Bieller-Snyder Papers (Department of Archives, Louisiana State University).

¹⁵ Mercantile Agency to Wilson and Dupuy, November 28, 1848, *ibid.*

¹⁶ W. O. Anderson of New Orleans to Alonzo Snyder, November 18, 1844, *ibid.*

ing a statement. Although he apparently accepted the agency at once, since his letters reveal his anxiety to make a connection with Tappan, the next reference in his correspondence did not appear until the following April. On the third of that month Tappan wrote of having sent him a request to take over Madison Parish on February 12, but stated that no reply had been received. On April 20 Tappan, acknowledging receipt of a letter in which Snyder had asked for the privilege of reporting on several parishes, agreed to assign three to him and left the door open for further hope by saying that the request for the others could not be granted at that time. He also stated that he wanted the next general report by June, and that he wished Snyder to give special attention to Gorton and Mason at Waterproof, to W. B. Dunn and Thomas K. Knowland at Chesterfield Post Office, to C. H. Forman at St. Joseph, and to A. M. Young at Young's Point. He added that he was particularly anxious to receive a report on E. Davidson and Company, of Princeton, Mississippi, and although he realized that Princeton was several miles from Snyder's home, he asked him to forward any information which he could obtain.¹⁷

As the case of Wilson and Dupuy and Snyder shows, eastern agencies could retain lawyers as correspondents simply by promising to recommend them to eastern wholesalers for the handling of claims which had to be collected by suit. This was perhaps the only feasible system until money was available to hire representatives, and it worked reasonably well, as is demonstrated by the growth of Tappan's business. None the less, it had too many faults to be continued when money was available to change to another method; and Snyder himself was soon to demonstrate one of its major weaknesses. The chief ante-bellum competitor of Tappan's group in the South seems to have been W. A. Cleveland, of New York City, and, beginning in 1849, Snyder attempted to work for both firms by accepting an agency from Cleveland for the very same parishes in which he represented Tappan. The fact that Cleveland wanted specific information on some of the same men about whom Tappan had asked, such as C. H. Forman, W. B. Dunn, and Thomas

¹⁷ "Lewis Tappan per Benj. Douglass" to Snyder, April 3, 20, 1849, *ibid.*

K. Knowland, is an indication of the sharp competition which existed between the newly developing eastern credit rating agencies.¹⁸

That Cleveland followed virtually the same plan of operation as Tappan is shown in his correspondence with John W. Ellis, of Salisbury, North Carolina, who had obtained the right to represent him in eight counties, although Cleveland originally had tried to limit him to four. When, in the spring of 1847, Ellis failed to give information on a number of men in his territory, Cleveland asked for data on fifteen firms at Wadesboro, four at Mocksville, one at Spring Garden, five at Salisbury, one at Jones Cross Roads, one at Flat Swamp, and others scattered over that region. About fifty storekeepers had been overlooked by Ellis, and Cleveland listed them all in his request for additional reports. The names may have been taken from a postal directory, but, whatever the source, Cleveland obviously intended to teach thoroughness to his correspondents, especially when they insisted on representing more territory than he thought wise. During the following months Cleveland continued to ask for detailed reports on a number of specific cases, and Ellis must have been kept fairly busy if he gave proper attention to his work.¹⁹

In spite of their rapid growth, it is probable that credit rating agencies did not handle the majority of such business in the South even as late as the eve of the Civil War. Surviving manuscript collections of ante-bellum southern lawyers generally contain more letters directly from eastern wholesalers asking for reports on storekeepers than from eastern credit rating agencies. Indeed, the correspondence of such men in the 1840's and 1850's, taken by itself, reveals little change in methods

¹⁸ George H. Clapp of New York City to Snyder, January 11, 1849; W. A. Cleveland to Snyder, January 26, May 3, September 12, 1849, *ibid.*

¹⁹ Cleveland to John W. Ellis, April 6, 27, August 21, September 3, October 28, 1847, February 2, 1848, in John W. Ellis Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina). Agencies had to furnish a reasonable amount of collecting if they were to get honest and efficient service in return. Collecting was thus closely related to credit rating from the first. Foulke, *Sinews of American Commerce*, 323, says that the agency which was started by Tappan created a "Mercantile Claims Department" in 1857 to assist in collecting past accounts for clients. In 1855, however, James W. Bryan received a claim to collect for the "Collection Department" of the Mercantile Agency. B. Douglass and Company to Bryan, April 12, 1855, in Bryan Papers.

from those employed before the panic of 1837. Such material of course does not reveal the relationship between eastern wholesalers and eastern credit rating agencies, and cannot be taken as a complete criterion for determining the success of the newer methods of credit rating. None the less, the survival of the collecting attorney does demonstrate that older methods gave way slowly, and that credit rating agencies faced a real problem in establishing themselves with business men.

The limited volume of business done by credit rating agencies may be attributed to a number of factors, in addition to their relatively late establishment. First of all, some eastern firms seem to have preferred to rely on their own members or employees for estimates of the financial standing of customers. Peter Mallett, for instance, who had left North Carolina to pursue a New York business career, made credit rating trips through parts of his native state in 1846, and again in 1849, apparently to obtain information primarily for the benefit of his own commission house, Krider and Mallett. His dislike for the long trips which such work required seems to have been more than offset by the advantage of knowing at first hand the financial condition of customers.²⁰

Mallett's credit reports were written in a clear and piquant manner, but in form seem to have been much like those of other credit reporters of his day. He followed a somewhat routine form, giving information on the number of years a firm had been in business, the capital employed, its credit standing, the business habits and character of the owners, the yearly volume of its business, and any general knowledge which might be of value in judging its financial condition. He also commented on the business of towns as a whole. In both 1846 and 1849 New Bern appeared to him to be a declining place for trade, principally because of the decrease of its business in naval stores. Failures there had been common, and consequent sales of goods had injured local storekeepers as a whole. Except for a few old, established firms,

²⁰ Peter Mallett (writing from Washington, North Carolina) to Mrs. Peter Mallett, January 13, 1850, in Peter Mallett Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina).

which he listed, he felt that it would be dangerous to credit New Bern business men to any extent. On the other hand, Hamilton, in Martin County, was highly praised. "This village situated pleasantly," he reported. "Formerly nearly deserted . . . now quite a flourishing place. . . . Joseph Waldo is entitled to the credit of making the Place. He came here a Yankee pedlar, opened a store made money & is now engaged in Distilling shipping & owns a vessel & to all appearance is solvent."

On the first of his two trips Mallett compiled a "Credit Rating Book of North Carolina Firms," and on the second trip three years later, covering the same territory, he seems merely to have made changes in his original estimates whenever the standing of a storekeeper made this necessary.²¹ The following extracts from his rating of individual firms will serve to illustrate the nature of his entries and to throw light on the range of his judgments:

Fayetteville: G. M. Ross. No capital, not much of a business man, doing but little & must eventually sink. [On the later trip this firm was marked "failed."]

Warsaw: W. Pierce. No. 1 & making money.

Silesville: M. P. Siles. Lord of all he surveys and no. 1.

Elizabethtown: J. Bryan. Has sold his old stock & will commence again. Capital 8 or 10,000. Undoubted credit, shrewd, prudent & understands himself, though too fond of his *Bitters*. Prompt.

Snow Hill. Green County. G. S. Pridgen. Years few. Capital moderate. Extent of trade 8 or \$10,000. Business habits good has made money & is a close prudent man.

Chas. Harper & Son. Capital 20 or \$25,000. In business many years & made money. Extent of trade 8 or \$10,000. Business habits & good character.

Greenville, Pitt Co. Wm. Barnard. A shrewd old Frenchman. Years 15. Capital 70 or \$80,000. Business habits good. Character good. Trade 15 or \$16,000. Is perfectly safe.

Cooper & Strong. Capital moderate. Business habits tolerable. They are *Yankees* & have recently moved here. Is well enough to let them alone.

Tarboro. Bowditch & Howell. Not in business long & but few know their circumstances. H. is a mean scotchman & B. a contracted Yankee.

²¹ This book, now in the Peter Mallett Papers, is a red-backed notebook, about 2½ by 5 inches, which contains 124 unnumbered pages. Notes taken on the 1846 trip were recorded in ink and changes made in 1849 were added in pencil.

Washington. Wm. Barnard & Son. Years 2 or 3. Capital 75 or \$80,000. Wm B. the father is the capitalist. Son a lawyer by Pro- & no business man. Business carried on chiefly by his clerk. They do a large business.

Newbern. C. Kelly. Years few. Capital moderate. A prudent close, penny saving old Fellow, enjoys public confidence & credit at home. Good for what he buys.

Wm. G. Bryan. Years 12. Capital not much. Quite embarrassed though has strong friends. Business habits & character good. Is P. M. Magistrate etc. Doing a fair business. I would rather not sell him.

F. Pearce. Years 6 or 8. Failed in Swansboro a few years ago & compromised at 50 cents. Capital considerable. Is doing a large business, principally Groceries. Extent of trade 8 or \$10,000. Business habits & character good & has Public confidence. Is close & prudent.

Chapel Hill. J. C. Holmes. Greatly overrated in N. Y. Capital small & by no means a desirable customer. Habits Good. Quite active & attentive to business & appears to be doing well. But there is a deficiency somewhere.

Although reports collected directly by a member of the firm probably were more valuable than those received in other ways, they constituted the most expensive form of credit rating. Some firms attempted to meet this problem by assigning to traveling representatives a number of additional duties, such as collection of debts, the building of good will, and solicitation of new business.²² In general, however, the cost factor undoubtedly prevented this method from interfering to any great extent with the development of the new credit rating agencies.

A second and more important limitation on the growth of such agencies was the tendency of wholesalers to continue to rely on collecting attorneys for information. These attorneys made no charge for this service, and experienced lawyers who had devoted their attention to such matters for several years probably surpassed those who worked

²² Among the numerous letters which throw light on the nature and extent of this practice, the following may be cited as typical: William M. Shute of Montgomery, Alabama, to Edward Kellogg and Company of New York City, December 1, 1834, and Shute to Kissam and Company of New York City, January 16, 1836, in William M. Shute Letter Book, 1834-1837 (Alabama Department of Archives and History); H. B. Eilers of Wilmington, North Carolina, to Wilson and Hopkins of Baltimore, April 9, 1846, in H. B. Eilers Letter Book, 1846-1850 (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina); W. H. Washington to Ellis, June 10, 1847, in John W. Ellis Papers; Lee and Brewster of New York City to Watts, Jones and Jackson of Montgomery, September 30, 1848, and W. T. Eustis and Company of Boston to Watts, Jones and Jackson, October 18, 1848, in Thomas H. and John W. Watts Manuscript Collection (Alabama Department of Archives and History).

with credit rating agencies in their formative period. The Bryans of New Bern, North Carolina, for example, continued their close relationship with eastern wholesalers until increasing age and affluence brought a change in their plan of operation. Although James W. Bryan had turned his attention mostly to investing his money in the later 1850's, and obviously was not anxious to have new business, a Baltimore firm wrote him in 1860 in regard to collecting an account from a North Carolina storekeeper. His name had been suggested by still another merchant, and the Baltimore house was anxious to obtain his services.²³ Similarly, Thomas H. and John W. Watts and their legal partners, of Montgomery, Alabama, advised eastern firms widely over a period of years. In 1848 Moore and Company, of New York City, asked them for information on the firm of Leaird and McRae, and later had them handle the legal business arising from the failure of that firm. The same company wrote to them again in 1851 that it was gradually increasing its business around Montgomery, and expressed its appreciation for their assistance in bringing this about. Their "kindly and favorable influence," it said, was constantly being felt. Other New York houses, as well as some in Boston, also relied heavily on these lawyers for advice on customers in Alabama. In 1851, for example, Carleton and Company, of New York City, thanked them for a remittance in one case, mentioned having heard of the bankruptcy of another customer and asked for information on him, and requested an opinion on whether the prospects of still a third continued to improve.²⁴ Even those lawyers who worked with credit rating agencies often furnished information directly to eastern wholesalers when an opportunity arose. John W. Ellis of Salisbury, North Carolina, for instance, did not let his connection with W. A. Cleveland's agency in 1847 prevent him from advising mercantile firms in Baltimore.²⁵

²³ Young and Carson of Baltimore to James W. Bryan, February 27, 1860, in Bryan Papers.

²⁴ Moore and Company to Watts, Jones and Jackson, May 9, 1848, and March 28, 1851; Carleton and Company to Watts, Jones and Jackson, June 6, 1851, in Watts Manuscript Collection.

²⁵ Pleasants and Coffman of Baltimore to Ellis, January 7, 1847, in John W. Ellis Papers.

A third factor which tended to limit the growth of credit rating agencies was the liberality with which some eastern houses handled southern accounts. Not only did letters from merchants and former merchants continue to be employed as a means of obtaining credit in both southern and northern wholesale houses,²⁶ but as late as 1849 John P. Stagg and Company, of New York City, sold a North Carolina storekeeper a bill of goods on his own representation, apparently being induced to do so by his talk of strict economy and sales for cash at retail. Shortly after his return home this storekeeper wrote to the New York firm and suggested a settlement at forty cents on the dollar.²⁷ The continuance of such generous credit policies and of traditional methods of credit rating naturally presented an additional obstacle for the new mercantile agencies to overcome.

Development of the agencies was also hampered by the fear with which they were regarded, and by certain weaknesses in their scheme of operation. Even the most honest and reliable storekeepers often opposed them through dread of the great power which they were supposed to wield. Just as he was preparing to abandon his legal practice for a venture in eastern wholesaling, James W. Bryan became very much perturbed by a report that he was a representative for an eastern agency. Storekeepers in his part of the state had not objected to his work as a collecting attorney, he said, and in fact, he seems to have relied on the acquaintanceship which this provided to help him get started in the wholesale field. Representation of an eastern agency, however, was an entirely different matter. Local rumors that he had formed such a connection caused him to write the following letter to Griffin, Cleveland, and Campbell, of New York City, in 1836:

Gentlemen: An excitement of no ordinary character has been created among the merchants of Newbern, N. C., in consequence of a belief on their part, that an undue representation of their standing, and ability as merchants has been made

²⁶ William C. Grasty of Mt. Airy, Virginia, to D. W. Moore of Lynchburg, April 12, 1844, in William C. Grasty and John F. Rison Papers (Duke University Library). A number of letters in the Bryan Papers also confirm the continuation of this practice as late as 1855.

²⁷ John P. Stagg and Company to James W. Bryan, December 4, 1849, in Bryan Papers.

through the agency of your firm to their New York creditors; and among others it has fallen to my lot to be charged as being your agent and correspondent. For the satisfaction of my immediate friends alone I should be glad for you to state whether I am your agent or correspondent. I trust you will pardon this unprecedented application & request on my part as I am induced to make it in consequence of the necessity of the case alone.

The eastern men seem to have replied almost immediately. The publication of a letter by a Mr. Mayo, they said, had revealed to them the excitement which their proposed scheme had aroused in the South. Although they believed that their plan of collecting information on merchants would have been helpful to good men, and prejudicial only to those unworthy of credit, southern merchants had viewed the plan in "so objectionable a light," that they had abandoned it in that section. "We have no such plan in operation there & do not intend to attempt it there," they wrote Bryan. "If you have been the subject of suspicion we sincerely regret it, as you are not our correspondent or agent & are in no way connected with us in this plan."²⁸

This attitude was not limited to the South alone,²⁹ but it apparently survived with greater tenacity in that section than elsewhere. Eastern credit rating agencies seldom were mentioned publicly in southern records, but comments almost invariably were unfavorable when such mention did appear. The secrecy promised by the agencies for their local southern representatives perhaps came in part from a realization of the hostility which was felt toward men who dared to act as correspondents. Opposition seems to have centered largely around the fear of having unknown parties pass judgment on so vital an aspect of business as an individual's credit standing. Generous and long-term credit was essential to country stores, and any change in the pattern of measur-

²⁸ Griffin, Cleveland, and Campbell to Bryan, May 26, 1836, *ibid.*

²⁹ "A Merchant of Boston," in discussing "Traits of Trade—Laudable and Iniquitous," in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine* (New York, 1840-1870), XXIX (1853), 50-57, severely castigates what he calls the "Mercantile Inquisition." His chief objection seemed to be to the use of young lawyers who had no practice and to the opportunity which the system gave correspondents of the agencies to strike at men in their communities whom they did not like for religious or business reasons, or even because of rivalry for the hand of some local girl.

ing the wisdom of an extension of credit naturally aroused the hostility of the merchant.

Southern papers occasionally attacked the agencies in editorials. In 1852 a Baton Rouge paper commented on rumors that an eastern credit rating agency had recently attempted to establish a local connection. Eastern wholesalers were willing to establish a "Paul Pry" in every southern community, said the editor, but he hoped that no citizen of such base character as to lend himself to the "ignoble purpose" had been found in Baton Rouge. If anyone had been imposed upon, the editor wished to remind him that Arthur Tappan had lately been sued for giving false information, to the injury of a storekeeper, and had been penalized \$10,000 for his action.³⁰

Two years later another Baton Rouge paper printed a discussion of mercantile agencies under the title, "A Commercial Inquisition." Tappan's agency seems to have been the one which the editor had in mind, and he flayed it unmercifully. No longer did a man's intrinsic worth and personal recommendations help him when he went east to buy, declared the editor. Now a clerk was sent out to the "Inquisition" to check the applicant's credit, and there was no appeal from its verdict. Reports were prepared by spies who had been selected secretly from the legal profession and who often gave false information. "Talk of Vidocq or Fuche police—Japanese espionage—damnable leechers and hireling bloodsuckers; it is all honorable—legitimate—and proper in the place of this most villainous inquisition," fulminated the angry editor.³¹ A Franklin, Louisiana, paper in the same year devoted a full column to a discussion of "Mercantile Spies." The editor obviously knew less about the operation of mercantile agencies than did his colleague in Baton Rouge, but he was equally as vitriolic. He feared that every Southerner would soon find his name listed in an eastern register. Then, he asserted, "No home will be secure, no privacy will be sacred from these harpian visitors. Neighbor will doubt neighbor & fear will

³⁰ Baton Rouge *Gazette*, January 3, 1852. Foulke, *Sinews of American Commerce*, 292-93, discusses the standing of mercantile agencies before the courts, but does not cite material from the South or discuss general mercantile or newspaper opposition.

³¹ Baton Rouge *Weekly Comet*, July 2, 1854.

check social intercourse. Let every honorable merchant cease business with wholesalers who use mercantile agents."³²

Such hysterical charges of course exaggerated the faults of mercantile agencies. Their very survival depended on fair and accurate reports. In the early years certain weaknesses, among them the calibre of the agents employed, did, however, provide some basis for criticism. In most cases only young lawyers or those who for some reason had not prospered seemed to be willing to accept appointments as agents. John W. Ellis, for example, was in his twenties when he accepted the position of correspondent for W. A. Cleveland in North Carolina. He had a fair legal practice, but not yet sufficient to prevent his considering a move to St. Louis in the hope of improving his condition. Ellis was greatly interested in politics, and not long after taking over the Cleveland agency he became a judge. Later he was elected governor of his state and died in 1861, while holding that office. As soon as he began his rise in politics he abandoned the collecting field. In other words, he accepted the position as Cleveland's correspondent as a young man in the hope of furthering his slender law practice, held it only a short time, and abandoned it as soon as political preferment came his way.³³ Alonzo Snyder, on the other hand, was an experienced lawyer in 1849 when he took up the work of correspondent in Louisiana, but his effort to serve two competing agencies simultaneously suggests at least a certain laxity in professional ethics. He was appointed to the bench in the same year, however, and abandoned his commercial work soon afterward.³⁴

The short period in which both Ellis and Snyder served as corre-

³² Franklin (La.) *Planters' Banner*, July 6, 1854. The writer has seen such articles only in Louisiana papers, although similar statements in newspapers of other southern states may have been overlooked. It is clear that hostility toward mercantile agencies was not limited to Louisiana.

³³ The material in the John W. Ellis Papers is heavy on Ellis' relations with merchandising and economic matters up to 1848, but beginning with that year his papers change over wholly to his work as judge and his political career.

³⁴ Henry Ellett of Port Gibson, Mississippi, to Snyder, November 1, 1849, in Bieller-Snyder Papers, congratulates Snyder on his appointment to a judgeship. Snyder's commercial correspondence declined rapidly after that date, and he seems to have abandoned any attempt to extend his contacts in that field.

spondents for eastern agencies makes it difficult to determine whether or not the work proved remunerative. Each had only one or two legal cases referred to him, and it is significant to note that in his printed material Tappan heavily stressed future prospects. Only a young or unsuccessful lawyer was likely to be attracted by a connection which did not guarantee a definite remuneration, especially when local hostility also had to be considered. The Tappans seem to have endeavored to attract experienced collecting attorneys into their organization. In 1843, for example, Lewis Tappan wrote Charles Crommelin of Montgomery, Alabama, that Robert Jaffray, for whom Crommelin regularly collected bills, had recommended him to Tappan as a good man to collect a note for \$1,367.40.⁸⁵ Crommelin was asked for an immediate opinion of the case; but in spite of the fact that Tappan employed the strongest possible appeal by sending an account for immediate collection and by displaying an acquaintanceship with one of his best New York customers, Crommelin seems never to have accepted a connection with an eastern agency. His business was already established, and he was no doubt correct in thinking that he had nothing to gain by releasing knowledge based on long experience and acquaintance in Montgomery to an outside credit rating agency. Business would come his way because of his reputation, and so he preferred to retain his information for his personal clients.

James W. Bryan, of New Bern, North Carolina, was in a similar position. His long career as a lawyer, his experience as a New York wholesaler, his wide acquaintance in the South through political and economic activities, and his reputation as a reliable and honest lawyer brought him an adequate clientele. Various agencies wrote him at times about references and accounts, but they were never able to persuade him to place his knowledge at their disposal by sending in regular reports. Older men did not need the help of agencies to build their business, and younger men dropped out if they became successful in politics or other fields. Correspondents were available, but in both quality and

⁸⁵ Tappan to Ball and Crommelin, May 18, 1843, in Crommelin Papers.

turnover of representatives the mercantile agencies had problems which hampered the development of their business.

The necessity of experimenting with various policies before settling on a definite form of operation also provided a basis for criticism of the credit agencies. A number of different men were in the field during the 1840's and 1850's, and a mistake by one reflected on all. James W. Bryan's correspondence furnishes an insight into the variations being tested out by eastern agencies. In 1837 G. and W. Wheaton, of New York City, attempted to obtain his co-operation in building up a straight collecting business all over the country.³⁶ Bullitt and Fairthorne, of Philadelphia, approached him as late as 1852 with a similar proposition.³⁷ In 1851 William A. Woodward sent Bryan a circular announcing his withdrawal from the credit rating agency of Woodward and Dusenberry, of New York City, after nine years as senior partner. Woodward now proposed to obtain mercantile collections covering all parts of the United States. Lawyers were to collect and forward accounts at maturity without making any charge to eastern wholesalers, and in return were to receive whatever business came their way in handling those which defaulted. As his reward for handling the eastern end of the business, Woodward proposed to charge only one-third of what lawyers who joined him in the scheme obtained for their services.³⁸ Livingston, Allen and Livingston, of New York City, offered still another variation to lawyers in 1858. They proposed to publish a monthly catalogue of outstanding collecting attorneys in every county in the United States, which, of course, would become a handbook for wholesalers who needed the services of a lawyer. A fee was to be paid by each man whose name was included in the catalogue.³⁹

Such schemes show that collecting and credit rating were at first combined and that men were turning to one or the other as their experience dictated. The numerous variations and changes were sure to retard the

³⁶ G. and W. Wheaton to Bryan, March 27, 1837, in Bryan Papers.

³⁷ Bullitt and Fairthorne to Bryan, March 15, 1852. *ibid.*

³⁸ Printed circular, dated March, 1851, *ibid.*

³⁹ Printed circular, 1858, in Thomas A. R. Nelson Papers (Lawson McGhee Library, Knoxville).

amount of business transacted by credit rating agencies while they were taking place, even though the changes might prove beneficial in the end. The Tappan agency in its various forms was perhaps the strongest of those operating in the southern territory during the ante-bellum period, but it had by no means cleared the field of numerous would-be competitors. Furthermore, none of these agencies was helped in its quest for business by the continued tendency of the wholesalers to sell their goods on credit without careful investigation of purchasers, and because the South had not suffered as heavily from the panic of 1857 as had other parts of the country, eastern merchants continued to sell on extremely liberal credits there. The persistence of this practice led a writer in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine* to say, on the basis of observations made on a southern trip, that eastern wholesalers seemed to be obsessed with the idea of selling goods to merchants of all kinds in all of the remote towns and counties of the South, most of whom should never have been heard of in New York City. He characterized such sales as the equivalent of "a sort of gratuitous contribution for building up and improving Southern small towns and neighborhoods," and suggested that if the wholesalers were determined to help the South by outright grants it would be better to give money to the Home Missionary Society.⁴⁰ Such comments would seem to show that although the progress made by the mercantile agencies and the individualistic activities of the dealers had created a consciousness of the problem of credit rating in the South, the problem itself was yet to be solved at the outbreak of the Civil War. On the other hand, the wealth of experimentation which had been carried on and the increasing familiarity with credit rating methods which had at first aroused hostility undoubtedly provided a basis of historical continuity for improvement in the system as business relations between North and South were resumed after the war.

⁴⁰ "Some Suggestions on Southern Trade," in *Hunt's Merchants' Magazine*, XXXIV (1856), 522.

Notes and Documents

SOME PERSONAL LETTERS OF ROBERT E. LEE, 1850-1858

EDITED BY WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

"Fighting is the easiest part of the soldiers duty. It is the watching, waiting, labouring, starving, freezing, wilting, exposure & privation, that is so wearing to the body & trying to the mind." These words from a letter written by Robert E. Lee to Jerome Napoleon Bonaparte in February, 1855, show that the man who later became the military leader of the Confederacy had a real understanding of the feelings of the soldiers under his command. The letter itself is one of an even dozen in a correspondence between Lee and the son of the ill-fated match of Baltimore's Betsy Patterson and the Emperor Napoleon's brother Jerome—all of them in the Bonaparte Papers at the Maryland Historical Society.

The first three letters were written from Baltimore, where Lee was in charge of the construction of Fort Carroll in the harbor, and two of them were dated during the summer or early fall months when Bonaparte was out of town. The last letter was penned from "Arlington," the Lee home in Virginia looking across the Potomac River at Washington. The others were scratched off while Lee was busy with the many details of his work as superintendent of the United States Military Academy at West Point. All the letters have a friendly, chatty quality which does not appear so clearly in Lee correspondence previously published.

Various subjects were discussed in the correspondence. There is much discussion of the progress of young Jerome Bonaparte, Jr., as a cadet at

West Point, his appointment as an instructor in French, and his possible transfer to the dragoons. In the letter of March 12, 1853, there is an interesting comment on Lee's superintendency, with some indication that he did not find the work altogether pleasant and would be glad when his tour of duty came to an end. In many of the letters there are remarks on affairs at West Point, with references to the continuous stream of guests, the morale of the corps, and the troubles of individual cadets; and also—very often—glimpses of a man busy with the details of reports and other administrative routine. Possibly most important of all are Lee's comments on the Crimean War and the siege of Sevastopol, remarks based on his own experiences in the Mexican War a few years earlier. Throughout the letters are cheerful messages to Mrs. Bonaparte, revealing Lee as something of a gallant.

Jerome Napoleon Bonaparte (1805-1870), the recipient of the letters, was a prominent citizen of Baltimore, who devoted his time to the management of the extensive property which he had acquired through inheritance and marriage. Although he did not take an active part in his mother's campaign to obtain official recognition of the American Bonapartes, he did go to France during the period of the Lee correspondence and succeeded in having his son (the Jerome mentioned in the letters) accepted as a member of the imperial family and commissioned in the French army. Mrs. Bonaparte was Susan May Williams (1812-1881), daughter of a Roxbury, Massachusetts, merchant. The "Charley" of the letters was a younger son, Charles Joseph Bonaparte (1851-1921), who later served as secretary of the navy and attorney general in Theodore Roosevelt's cabinet.

Baltimore 19 Sept. 1850

My dear Mr Bonaparte

Upon the reception of Mrs Bonaparte's letter with your postscript; I despatched a letter to Capt. Brewerton;¹ asking if necessity did not require it, & it could be done, with justice to Jerome & the Academy; that he be allowed to retain his military appointment in the Corps, & to waive the academic appointment of asst. teacher of French. But it was too late & the deed was done. I am

¹ Henry Brewerton (d. 1879), captain, 1836, major, 1856.

glad to find by your letter of the 12, that you are more reconciled to the change, which I do not think will be to his disadvantage, or will interfere with his being made Adjutant, when the necessity of his present office ceases. Perhaps you think like a sensible man, that when a thing is done, nothing remains but to make the best of it. That is right. Still I must not leave you under the impressions you entertained when you first wrote. You then seemed to be at a loss to reconcile the kind feelings, which you believed Capt. B. to entertain for Jerome, with his present appt. If the appt. of an asst. Teacher of French was necessary, it is surely a compliment to Jeromes knowledge & character, that he should be selected. That is plain. But should it be necessary to make one from his class, it would be doing him injustice, who stands *first* to select the second. That *I* would object to. And if Capt. B. believed that Jerome was the fittest person in the Corps for the situation, his duty to the Institution & justice to the cadets of the fourth class would require him to appoint him. You see now the disadvantages of having a son, whose services are necessary to the Country. This necessity may pass away with the present term. In that case, I think it very certain, that he will be restored to his mil: rank, & appd Adjutant next encampment. His present work at the Academy is however above that of his fellow Cadets, & next to the Commd Officers.

Tell Mrs Bonaparte, I had sat down to write to her, & thank her for her kind letter of the 9, which as I did not merit, I did not expect; but the uncertainty of its finding her in Winchester, & my unwillingness that any letter for her, should be hawked about by the Postmasters, deterred me. I nevertheless am truly grateful for her kindness & duly appreciate it.

The houses in town all give indication of the return of their occupants. Windows are open, brushes are flourishing, & dust flying. Yours still retains its closed impassiveness. Mr Meredith has come back charmed with Jenny Lind, & the people here are in extacies at the announcement this morn; that the Front St. theatre, has been engaged for her performance,² & that the *Germania Band* will again this winter, gladden them with their soft music. All the Belles of the city are said to be engaged, which has caused the belief in others of their sex, that the millenium is at hand. Mrs Lee has been much occupied in assisting one of her Virga Cousins, Miss Stuart, whom you may recollect having seen here last Spring, select her wedding paraphranalia. It is finished, & I have just been summoned to pass judgement on the dresses, that have arrived from Miss *Browns*.

² The Front Street Theatre was built in 1829, with a court at the rear opening on Jones Falls and steps descending to the water. Jenny Lind arrived in Baltimore on December 8, 1850. She was escorted to Barnum's Hotel by a crowd of several thousand persons; there she received in the afternoon and was serenaded at night by the Independent Grays Band. The Front Street Theatre was crowded to capacity for all four concerts, which took in \$60,000.

Tell Mrs. B. I have sent her message to Custis, who will be greatly delighted at it. Rooney send his love & begs she will pardon Grace for declining her polite invitation for the 2nd Oct. at 12. She never attends the feasts of the foxes who have lost their tails. He says how you must regret the sacrifice of Nobles graceful appendage. You would now have a pair of them.

All join me in kindest regards to Mrs B. Mrs W. & yourself, & in the pleasurable expectation of the arrival of the 1st Oct. Please present me in an acceptable manner to Dr & Mrs Hoffman & believe me very truly yours

R E LEE

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I have just recd & read a review of the "Memoir on the U. S. Arty." The memoir itself I have not seen, but I think you will be able to get at its spirit if not its merits from the pages of the reviewer.

If you would like to read it, please return it me as early as convenient, as it has been loaned to me, with a request that it be returned. We are progressing with the measles & I think our invalids are better today, at least more comfortable.

With our best regards to Mrs B— I remain very truly yours

6 Feby [1852]

R E LEE

Baltimore 31 July 1852

My Dear Mr Bonaparte

My brother has a small package for his son Fitzhugh, which he is anxious he should get, as it contains some necessary clothing he inadvertently left behind. May I therefore ask the favour of you or Jerome to hand it to him, that being in my opinion the surest way of its reaching him.

Tell Mrs B— she has taken away a great part of my regret at leaving Baltimore by going away herself & diminished my reluctance to reach W. P. by placing herself there. I am very glad to hear that you both have recovered from your fall. I saw John yesterday. He said all were well. & the horses nearly recovered from their injury. One horse entirely.

Mrs M. Louis & the Judge have gone to Cape May. Mrs L has been at A— for some days. I go on in the 4 O'Clock train. All my things are shipped for N. Y. I have wound up my matters at S. except settling the accounts—

Remember me to Mrs B. Mrs W & Charly & believe me very truly yours

R E LEE

West Point 12 March 1853

I should have sooner acknowledged, My dear Mr Bonaparte, your letter of the 27 Ulto, but have been obliged to save my eyes for the service they had to perform that was indispensible. I have not how ever been the less thankful

for your kind recollection, nor sympathized the less with Mrs B. in her indisposition, because I could not say so; & indeed tell her I am not certain that their affection was not caused by their furnishing a vent to my overcharged heart. But they are better now & I infer therefore that she is well, & truly hope that you are also released from your confinement & are enjoying your horse & exercise as usual. I understand that your good temper has remained imperturbable under the whole & there is only one more test that I wish to see it put to, before being satisfied that it is the best in the world. What a blessing it would be if it could only be possessed by the Supt. of the Mil Acady! My friend Charles Carter is mistaken. I am not *dissatisfied*. Nor has any soldier cause to be, while endeavouring to perform his duty. That duty may not be pleasant to him, & there may be circumstances attending it, distasteful & unpalatable, but while assigned to its performance, he has no right to be dissatisfied, still less to express it. As to the truth of your *prediction* time as you say will alone shew. I can only say that it has worked but little progress so far, & that I should pay but little attention to my feelings could I hope that a *portion* of what you kindly say I shall accomplish will be realized. I have more at heart the prosperity of the Academy than my own pleasure, while under my charge I shall administer it to the best of my ability But when called upon, shall relinquish that charge with more cheerfulness than I felt reluctance in undertaking it.

I am very glad you get such pleasing accounts from Jerome. He has all the qualities to make a good soldier, & where he can perform most service will always be most agreeable to him. His life of active service must be improving to him, in body & mind, & his temptations to those pleasures so captivating to the young, far less I think, than when aggravated by the idleness & listlessness enjoyed in Barracks & Cities. For my part I have no fear of his falling into such habits. He ought to be above their reach & I take it for granted he is. Still you & Mrs B. must aid his goodly nature, & make the life of virtue & rectitude so agreeable, that he can live no other. I suppose you will have seen Lacy & Ives on their route through B— I can therefore tell you nothing new of them. I must also leave to them to report the news of the Point. I do not know whether we have had more than the usual allotment of Colds, Catarrhs, Scarlet fever &c. But such complaints have been & still are very prevalent. The weather is wretched. Snow, wet, mud, mud, wet, snow. It snowed all yesterday, hailed all night & is now raining. Dr Simons was so ill yesterday I had to telegraph to New York for a Surgeon, & recall Dr Cuyler from his leave.³ He is better this morn. Mrs L. has been suffering from Cold, & I presume my eyes are indebted to the same cause for their pleasant state. My young friends are as well as usual. Some of them come to see us every Saturday. But I fear they find the

³ James Simons, captain and assistant surgeon, 1847-1856; John M. Cuyler, major and surgeon, 1847-1862.

Supt & his dame, dull commodities in the interchange of social pleasure. When you & Mrs B— come on to see us, we shall be more in favour. You said nothing of Charly & Mrs Emily H— You must bring them with you. I hope you got to the ball in Washn. The 1st Class are in communication with the *tailor*, the *batter*, the *boot & trunk maker*, & do not envy the Emperor, in his acquisition of a grand Empire & beautiful Empress. I wonder which is the happier in their anticipations! Mrs L. joins me in kindest regards to Mrs. B. Mrs H. Jerome, Charly & Mrs Wms. The mail is closing & I remain always most truly yours

R E LEE

West Point 19 March 1853

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I have just recd your letter of the 17th Inst. & lay aside my writing to answer it. I am very glad of the step you have taken in reference to Jerome. I was on the *point* of sending you a note by Ives for that very purpose; but was restrained by the thought, that it might prompt you beyond your natural suggestions, & that you & Mrs B— could better judge than I whether the transfer would be profitable to Jerome. In truth I think he *prefers* the Dragoons & the service in the *field*, & will have seen nothing as yet to change his views. My present object is therefore more to advise, should Jerome prefer to remain as he is, not to think yourself, or lead him to think, that he or you are under obligations to *accept* the transfer, but to let him exercise his own predilection. It is better I think that he should feel the stimulus of pride & emulation, than that he should run the risk of *disgust*. He will have an opportunity of consulting his taste, with the benefit of some little experience & I would let him exercise it, free & untraneled. If he does not wish to accept the transfer, it will not be improper for him to decline it. Genl Scott will understand it, & you can tell him that it was by my advice that he so acted—

I hope I have made myself understood—I have written between the receptions of the Professors with their weekly class reports & must now close to get my letter off this mg—

I am sorry to hear Mrs B. is still sick. Tell her I wish I was there to cure her—Mrs L would join me in all regards & love had she the opportunity.

If Jerome does not accept the transfer he can be restored to his former position, before the graduation of the present 1st Class, & no one will be thereby injured or have a right to complain. You are probably aware that Genl Scotts Head qrs will be changed to New York the 1st Proxo. Remember me to all friends—I will not speak of your letter till I hear all is satisfy arranged

Very truly

R E LEE

West Point. 11 April 1853

My dear Mr Bonaparte

By the first mail after the reception of your letter of the 31st Ultio. I wrote to Genl Smith at Phila. according to your desire: & have delayed replying to you, in the hope of recg from him an answer. I have not yet heard from him, & conclude that my letter has either not reached him, or that he did not think it called for an immediate reply. The only thing that I see now necessary to be done, is to get the Secy to act upon your application. Perhaps there is some delicacy felt in transferring an officer from one Corps to another, in the absence of an application from himself, or some exigency of the Pub. Service. But if Col: Craig⁴ *wants* more officers, as I understand from your letter he does; as one has been taken from him for another branch of the Service, he could with propriety apply for another to fill his place, & either name Jerome, or let the nomination be made according to the recommendation of the A— Board. In that way Jeromes claims would be brought up.

I think some fine day you had better run down to Washington, just to see how the wind blows. I will write to some friend to recall the matter to the Secy, who has probably overlooked it, in the multiplicity of affairs requiring his attention. An application from Jerome would bring it up at once.

Louis passed some days with us on his way west. I have never seen him look better, or more cheerful & happy. He was much pleased at seeing his old Comrades, & I was particularly pleased to find at dinner, that he invariably refused to take wine, & even with his classmates at parting. I commended his act at the time & hope he may always continue in the same disposition.

Lacy spent but a single day with us, & was only one day behind Louis. He having arrived the day L. left.

I am glad Mrs B. has met with Col Loring.⁵ I formed his acquaintance in Mexico, & thought him very gentlemanly in behaviour. His service was new to him, but his deportment & conduct good. I am sorry to hear his health is so bad.

I am very sorry to hear that Mrs B. has suffered from another attack of erysipelas. Tell her if she will come on here, our mountain air & mountain fare, will soon eradicate every thing of that kind. Bring her on in May. I shall not take otherwise, your message by Lacy as any excuse for your promised visit in June: Indeed tell Mrs B— I think she had better not go to the White Sulphur again, but had better come & stay with me. I recd last week a letter from the Commander, at the Cape of Good hope, who sent his particular regards to "Madame B. & Lady E."

Mrs. Taylor & Captn & Mrs Jones are here. They arrived friday & came Saturday evg. to help us entertain some of our Cadet friends—Mr & Mrs Sidney Brooks are to join them at our house this ev— & tomorrow we are to be hon-

⁴ Henry K. Craig, appointed chief of ordnance, July 10, 1851.

⁵ William W. Loring, lieutenant colonel, 1848, colonel, 1856.

oured with the Compy of Sir James Alexander, & Col D'Urban of the British Army.⁶ You & Mrs B— ought to be here for them.

Mrs Lee joins me in kindest regards to yourself Mrs B. Mrs W & Charlie. I wish this to go by this mornngs mail & must therefore close with our remembrances to Mrs Emily

Very truly yours

R E LEE

West Point 11 May 1853

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I am too sorry that your kind intentions of visiting us at the Point should have been frustrated just on the point of execution. I should have been particularly glad to have seen you, & I want much to hear of Mrs B— & all in Baltimore. So she has determined to go to the W. S. I see that W. P. is retrograding fast in her affections. The sooner I get away from it then the better. I wish I could go to the W. S. with you. My health is failing fast, & if I could get hold of a Dr sensible enough to see it, she might have other of her Army friends with her this Summer, besides Col P— & Campbell G—

I cannot help regretting the decision of the Secy in reference to Jeromes transfer, though think that he himself will thank him for it. I have always supposed, perhaps erroneously, that his consent to enter the ordnance, was caused by his desire to gratify your & his mothers wishes, but that his own predilections were against it. I therefore could not enter into the matter with my whole heart. As it is decided however, we must all be reconciled, & believe that it will eventuate for the best. His present service will be more agreeable to him & his promotion more rapid. He used to say to me in his modest way, that he thought he would make a very poor ordnance officer & a tolerable dragoon. I delayed replying to your preceding letter in the hope of seeing Genl Smith during his visit at New York. About the time I heard of his return to Washington, I was much occupied with my own & Mrs Ls distress at the death of her mother & the consequent events. Lt Huse⁷ went on to W— last friday to see if he could accomplish a transfer to the ordnance. I presume he had heard of the Secs decision in Jeromes case, though I do not know, as he said nothing to me of the object of his visit. I concur with you in hoping that Genl Scott may be gratified in the appointment of the new Inspector Genl. If the Pres: had have taken the appointment in his own hands, I believe he would, but I consider it now very doubtful. Col Scott is an excellent man & good officer, & though there are men in the Army who may be considered as having

⁶ Sir James Alexander (1803-1885), British soldier and traveler, who served in Canada from 1841 to 1855; Colonel D'Urban may have been a son of General Sir Benjamin D'Urban, commander of forces in Canada, who died in Montreal in 1849.

⁷ Caleb Huse, second lieutenant, 1851, first lieutenant, 1854.

greater claims, I think that all would be willing, as a personal gratification to the Genl, that he should get it. I have heard men named for the office, whom I do not think so deserving as he, or who would fill it so well. Remember me to the Judge & Mrs M. when you have an opportunity. What will Mrs B do after the departure of Dr & Mrs Hoffman? I have no prospect of seeing either of you until you return from the W. S. Cannot you not bring her on here then? She will want to get the fashions of New York for herself & Charlie. You must fulfill your promise at all events. One of your citizens, Miss Gittings, left us yesterday, & two arrived, Capt & Mrs Chiffelle. We are getting on as usual. The Examn is close at hand, bringing pleasing anticipation to many. I hope all will be realized. Mrs L. is still with her father, who has had an attack of Pneumonia, but is pronounced better. I do not know when she will return. I am glad you get such gratifying letters from Jerome. Remember me to him when you write. Give my best love to Mrs B— & kind regards to Mrs W.

Very truly yours

R E LEE

West Point 31 May 1854

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I am very glad to hear that you & Jerome are about to embark for France. It will be as agreeable to you as beneficial to him, & I think you can fairly take great pleasure in comparing him with his Princely relatives. Where worth makes the man & rank is but the stamp, his head can tower as lofty as the best.

I am very sorry that you will not have time to pay us a visit, but can readily understand your engagements. You forget that the Examination commences tomorrow, when you speak of my being in New York. I should with much pleasure go down to meet you, but you will see that it is impossible—I am much obliged to you for your kind offer to take charge of any commissions, & you will see by the enclosed that I have taken advantage of it. You must also remember me very kindly to Mrs Hoffman if you see her, & do not forget to give Mrs Lee's & Bonaparte's regards to the Dr.

I hope you will have a safe & pleasant voyage, & much satisfaction from your visit, & that you & J— may speedily return to us —

I shall certainly see Mrs B— as I pass through Baltimore, & as you expect to return so soon, will hope to find you there on my return to W. P— I have much to do, & have besides to meet Mr Washn Irving at dinner to day—⁸

Wishing you both every happiness

I remain most truly yours

R E LEE

⁸ Washington Irving (1783-1859) lived at "Sunnyside," his home near Tarrytown on the Hudson.

West Point 4 Nov 1854

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I was much gratified at the reception of your letter from Paris, & should have acknowledged it at once; but there was not time for my answer to reach you before the day appointed for your return to this Country. I watched for the arrival of the Indiana & Baltic, but happened not to see the list of Passengers in the Africa, & it was not till several days after her arrival, that I learned you were among them. I then sat down to congratulate you on your safe return, but was called off, & put off, by divers matters, visits from various great Military Commanders of the Country &c, & finally by the Secy of War & Adj't Genl, & my paper is still lying before me, as I left it.

Yesterday's mail brought your very acceptable package of Maps of the Seat of War, which increased my mortification at not having acknowledged your kind letter or welcomed you back, & determined me amidst the Comparison of Muster Rolls, forwarding accounts &c not to let this mail pass without my doing so. I must first express my great pleasure at your safe return, & the hope you found Mrs B— & Charlie well. I know it made them happy. My feelings were so harrowed at the terrible Catastrophe of the Arctic, that I became anxious about all friends on the Water, & was sadly disapp'd at not seeing your arrival in the Indiana or Baltic, as I would then have felt assured of your safety. I am also very glad at the pleasant & satisfactory visit you had in France & the kindness of your reception by the Emperor & Country. I hope Jerome will never have cause to regret his leaving us, & feel sure, of his adding to the lustre of his name & distinction of his family. Now that he is recognized as one of the Princes of the Empire & placed in his proper position, our regrets at his leaving us ought to be diminished, though we see the probability of our also losing the father & Mother— I am very much obliged to you for the Maps & shall examine them with much interest. I have only had time as yet to glance at the several sheets & enjoy their perusal in anticipation. I only fear you have deprived yourself of them, in which case you must let me know.

The Secy left us yesterday after a three days visit.⁹ He went through the Several Sections of each Class, Barrack, Academies, *Stables* &c & seemed to take much interest in the condition of things. Whether he will be able to improve them I know not. There is but little doubt, but that the Admn will be in a minority the coming Cong — & the oppn in the following will be overwhelming — We are all well & all unite in much love & every kind wish for Mrs B— & yourself — Tell her I want to see her now more than ever & regret very much that I cannot get to Baltimore the purpose. The Cadets get on as usual— nothing turns them from their labours or aspirations. Their World is in themselves, & they care not how the *outside* wags—We expect Custis this Evg &

⁹ Jefferson Davis was the secretary of war in the Pierce cabinet, 1853-1857.

hope to learn much about you, Mrs B— & Charlie, to whom I again send kindest regards —

Believe me very truly & sincy

Yours

R E LEE

West Point 5 Decr 1854

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I have been expecting since the reception of your kind note of the 10— the visit you then led us to hope for. The Fall having passed into the Winter, & all the delights of our first permanent Snow Storm being now upon us, leads to despair of its realization; & I fear our only Communication will be through the pen. I hope Mrs B. has recovered from the effects of the Summer. Tell her I attributed her drooping to your absence & not the heat, & that consequently your return would have made all things right. I have not heard whether she got on to Miss Ella's wedding, or whether you were present on the occasion. I am told she looked very beautifully, no uncommon thing for her to do, but could not get to see her, even on her passage through New York. What will Charly do for his lady-love Emmy. I fear some Don will retain her in Spain. I never saw her till this Fall. She & Ella spent a week here in Sept. It was before Mrs Lees return, but they spent every evg I believe at our house & I thus saw much of them. She is very sweet & ladylike but not as beautiful as her sister. I have looked anxiously at every account from the Seat of War for a notice of Jeromes arrival, & I presume the mention of Prince Napoleon being at Constantinople was intended for him, as the same accounts stated that Prince N. was to lead the 4000 Stormers that had been selected to assault the breach. Sebastopol holds out manfully, & the Russians are making a better defense than I anticipated. But the fact is the Allies are outnumbered by too large odds for their work. Their *available* strength I expect has always been overstated. It is one thing to send a certain number of men into a distant Country, & another to have them actually for duty, in the trenches & batteries. Disease, Constant labour, Exposure & battle thin the ranks amazingly. I know in Mexico Genl Scotts army in the field was about one third of the number which the official report of the Adjut Genl at Washington stated he *must* have, & which was based upon the number ordered & embarked. So I suppose it is there. Disease in the Camp has been more fatal to them than death in the field. Still it seems to me, that such indomitable Courage as they have shewn, if properly directed, must prevail; & notwithstanding the unfavourable accounts by the Baltic, I think S— will yet fall. I can heartily sympathize in their position, labours & anxiety, but while their Courage is so fine & brilliant there is no room to fear. I confess however their position appears to be critical. I have had the Map of the Gulf of Finland nicely mounted. That of Wallachia, Bulgaria & Roumilia was so, you may recollect. But there are

several sheets wanting of that of the Country around the Black Sea, Caspian Red &c. Those sheets you sent here probably belong to the sett you retained for yourself, & if so I will return them, as they are necessary to make your map complete, & without the others are of little or no use here. The other maps are very complete & excellent, & the best we have of the Countries represented; & the acady is extremely obliged to you for them.¹⁰

We are all well. Marys foot is slowly improving. She can step a little in it now & previous to this Snow storm rode every day on horseback 6 or 8 miles without inconvenience — That reminds me, you have not seen a horse in B— to ride & drive with Grace? I have written to several of my friends in this part of the Country but can hear of nothing. Mrs Lee & the girls join me in much love to Mrs B— Remember us kindly to Mrs W & believe me very truly yours

R E LEE

Lawrence W. is here, waiting to hear from the Qr Mr Genl in reference to his transportation in *advance*. Capt. & Mrs G. W. Smith¹¹ have broken up their house preparatory to his departure to Pensacola, where he is ordered & only waits the arrival of Lt Newlon of the Engrs to relieve him. In the meantime they are staying with us. Miss Helen Peters is also paying us a visit. The Officers & Cadets are all well & I hope the latter are doing so — REL

West Point 28 Feby 1855

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I recd by Casy the large Military map of Europe; & found the spare *sheets* previously mentioned formed a part of it, & added a broad strip of Country to the East & South. I have caused them to be attached, with a new roller & stretcher, & though it does not look so well, as if they had all been lined together, it makes a very complete & valuable map from the Atlantic on the West, to the Caspian Sea on the East, & embracing Norway & Finland to the North & the Southern shore of the Mediterranean on the South. I have presented the three maps to the Library in your name, & now in behalf of the Acady express our thanks for your valuable present. They will be a great addition to the Library & advantage to the Officers & Cadets.

I hope you continue to get satisfactory accounts from Jerome, & I am very glad to hear that he is comfortable & well. I have not yet seen the arrival of his Regt from Adrianople & presume he is still on the staff of Genl Morris. Mr Childe writes that he frequently hears of him through letters of Genl M. to his wife, & that he always speaks in high terms of him. There is so marked a difference between the Condition of the French & English troops, that it is

¹⁰ Lieutenant Colonel William J. Morton, Librarian of the United States Military Academy, reports that there is now no trace of these maps at West Point (1946).

¹¹ Gustavus W. Smith, made brevet captain for gallant and meritorious conduct at Contreras.

calculated to allay much anxiety that might otherwise be felt, & shews conclusively the superiority of the organization of the one over the other. Fighting is the easiest part of a soldiers duty. It is the watching, waiting, labouring, starving, freezing, wilting, exposure & privation, that is so wearing to the body & trying to the mind. It is in this state that discipline tells; & attention night & day on the part of the offr so necessary. His eye & thoughts must be continually on his men. Their wants anticipated & their comforts provided. The English offrs untaught by instruction have to learn by terrible experience the necessity of these things. I know you will rejoice with me in the tardy Compliment paid to Genl Scott.¹² I have had nothing to give me so much pleasure since the Capture of Mexico. The Genl has returned to New York. But I am never able to see him. I was very glad to hear from Rooney that Mrs B. & Charly were so well. Tell her I want to see her very much & the more as I fear my eyes will not hold out much longer. The short comings [&] necessities of my young friends are wearing them out fast, & I have to aid them with glasses, which pain me terribly. I think a sight of her would do me great good. Rooney left us yesterday with a heavy heart, poor fellow, for Cambridge. He said no one knew how sorry he was to leave W. P. & all hope of becoming a Cadet. I am very sorry, on his account, that he could not get an appointment. But I had no hope of it myself & endeavoured from the beginning to prepare him for it. I hope he will now be content & that it may turn out for the best. He enjoyed his visit to Baltimore very much, & descanted on the pleasure of the many rides he had with you; & the beauty & performance of Cooper, Nutter, Pepin & Jinny. Custis is still in Washington, about completing the drawings of the Fort at Cumberland Sound, on which he is to be engaged, & which have occupied him all the Winter. He expects to leave Washington next week. I should have much preferred, could it have been so arranged, that his duty had been at the South in the Winter, & at the North in the Summer. But he must take things as they come. The Officers & Cadets are all well, & the latter more attentive to their studies & duties, than they were before Jany — You may have seen in the papers an account of an accident that befell Cadet Gay. It was bad as it was, but I am happy to say was much exaggerated. As soon as I saw it, I wrote to his father, but before the arrival of my letter, his mother had left a sick bed & was on her way to him. His horse refused the leap, when Gay spurred through the Squad to the other side of the course, & instead of turning in the direction of the regular circuit, he forced his horse in the contrary direction, & met his rear rank file who had made the leap, & the shoulder of whose horse struck him on the leg midway between the knee & ankle & broke the bone. It is a simple fracture. He suffers no pain, is comfortable, & there is no reason now to apprehend any unfavourable result. He says it was his own fault, but I am sorry he will have a

¹² General Winfield Scott (1786-1866) was honored by a resolution of Congress giving him the pay, rank, and emoluments of a lieutenant general.

tedious time, & be kept from his studies. He is a smart young man, & before Jany was 2nd in his class in Engg — He seems to have at times an uncontrollable temper, which has previously got him in difficulty. I hope in time he will subject it at least to command, if he cannot subdue it —

The Court that was ordered on him for an attempted assault on the 1st Capt in the M. H. has been ordered to reconvine & revise their finding & action, & has again adjourned. Mrs Lee unites with me in kindest regards to Mrs B. Mrs W. & Charly — Mary's foot is improvg slowly I think, & she walks about the house now, but cannot yet wear her shoe.

I remain as ever very truly yours

R E LEE

P.S. This is *muster* day & as *usual* I have written amid many interruptions

REL

Arlington 14 June '58

My dear Mr Bonaparte

I have just recd your note of the 11th & am highly gratified at the prospect of having a reduction of your bust — I shall value it very highly, & place it among the most esteemed objects in the house.

Your letter was late reaching me in consequence of having been directed to Washington — Alexandria is our P Office — I shall send for the bust as soon as it ceases raining — I hoped you would have heard from Jerome. I am very anxious to learn the official announcement of his promotion —

I see announced in the papers the information you gave of the mission of Prince N to Algeria —

I hope Mrs B— has entirely recovered & am very glad to learn of the continued improvement of Judge M. Mrs. Lee joins me in affectionate regards to Mrs B. & yourself & I am very truly yours

R E LEE

A NOTE ON JAMES STUART, LOYALIST CLERGYMAN IN SOUTH CAROLINA

EDITED BY HENRY D. BULL

In most of the British colonies in America the members of the Anglican clergy were predominantly loyalist during the American Revolution, but in South Carolina all but five or six of the twenty clergymen were either supporters of the American cause or discreetly neutral. It

has been conjectured that this was due to the influence and leadership of the Reverend Robert Smith, rector of St. Philip's Church, Charleston, who was an ardent and devoted patriot.¹ When Charleston fell to the British in 1780 Smith was forced to leave the city, and took refuge in Philadelphia; but he returned after the war, and became the first bishop of the Diocese of South Carolina.

One of the small group of loyalist clergy in the state was the Reverend James Stuart, rector of Prince George Parish, Winyaw, Georgetown, South Carolina. This parish, founded by the colonial Assembly on March 10, 1721, led a checkered career for the first forty or fifty years of its existence. During two long periods it was without a church building, and it frequently lacked the ministrations of clergy. But after the coastal region north of the Santee River increased in population and prosperity, the handsome brick edifice which is still in use was erected about 1750 and the parish in the little seaport town began a much more stable period of activity. When the fourth rector, the Reverend Offspring Pearce, resigned in 1767 after a fairly long tenure of office, the vestry met with difficulty in securing a successor. The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts had discontinued work in the colony in 1766, and thus was unable to help them. An English friend of some of the vestrymen was authorized to offer a salary of £108 sterling per annum and expense of passage from England, but when no suitable candidate was found in England the church officials finally turned their attention nearer home. In 1772 they called the Reverend James Stuart, of Maryland, who accepted. In the summer of that year Stuart entered upon his work as curé,² and he also accepted the post of rector of the near-by parish of All Saints, Waccamaw.

Little is known of Stuart's background. Apparently he was not a native of Virginia, for on September 21, 1766, he was licensed by the Bishop of London for that colony, and he is listed as one of the Society

¹ Albert S. Thomas, "Robert Smith (1732-1801), First Bishop of South Carolina (1795-1801)," in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (Richmond, 1932-), XV (1946), 19.

² Frederick Dalcho, *An Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South-Carolina* (Charleston, 1820), 308.

for the Propagation of the Gospel missionaries for 1767-1768.³ Shortly after coming to Georgetown he married Mrs. Ann Allston Waties, a widow, the daughter of Thomas Allston of a well-to-do rice planting family of Waccamaw, a few miles away.⁴ Her son, William Waties, fought in General Francis Marion's brigade in the American army during the Revolution.

Georgetown was the prosperous port of entry for the wide coastal region north of the Santee River. The first four years of the war touched it lightly, and the business life of the place probably went on much as before, but among the people feeling rân high. There were many loyalists, though the patriots were in control of the situation. Stuart was a staunch adherent of the Crown, and as the war progressed his position became more and more difficult. Finally, on November 10, 1777, he discontinued his services, and on December 23 of that year informed the vestry that he could no longer officiate.⁵

His unhappy experiences in Georgetown and his later difficulties, which were perhaps typical of those of other South Carolina loyalists, are best related in his own words in the claim for losses which he presented in March, 1784, to the Parliamentary Commission on Loyalists' Claims and Services.⁶

³ For evidence of Stuart's appointment, see George E. Lamb (comp.), "List of Clergymen Licensed to the American Colonies by the Bishops of London, 1745-1781," in *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church*, XIII (1944), 141. For his connection with the S. P. G., see "Missionary Roll, S. P. G.," in Charles F. Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S. P. G.: An Historical Account of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701-1900*, 2 vols. (London, 1901), II, 850, where he is listed as having been assigned to the colony of North Carolina, 1767-1768, but that designation has a question mark before it.

⁴ See Henry D. Bull, "The Waties Family in South Carolina," in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (Charleston, 1900-), XLV (1944), 15-16.

⁵ Dalcho, *Protestant Episcopal Church in South-Carolina*, 308.

⁶ This memorial with supporting affidavits is in the New York Public Library collection of transcripts and digests from the Audit Office records in the Public Record Office, London, of the books and papers of the Commission of Enquiry into the Losses and Services of the American Loyalists (Manuscript Division, New York Public Library), Vol. 55, pp. 524ff. For a good general discussion of the problem, see Charles G. Singer, *South Carolina in the Confederation* (Philadelphia, 1941), 102-25. Additional details are presented in Robert W. Barnwell, Jr., "The Migration of Loyalists from South Carolina," in South Carolina Historical Association, *Proceedings* (Columbia, 1931-), 1937, pp. 34-46.

The Memorial of James Stuart, clerk.
Sheweth

That he was Rector of George Town Parish South Carolina when the late Troubles began in America, but for his Loyalty and Attachment to his Country, was violently assaulted by a Savage Mob, and when he appealed to the Justice of the Country for Redress, the very Judge applauded the Brutality of the Banditti, and encouraged the Aggressors even after Conviction, to insult him in their Court of Justice.⁷

Finding there was no Law, Justice or Protection for Loyal or even neutral Men, and reasonably apprehending his Life to be in danger, he betook himself to the West Indies in 1777 where he remained (borrowing Money for his Support) til the reduction of Georgia by His Majesty's Troops, an event which he flattered himself was preparatory to that of South Carolina: Accordingly he quitted the West Indies, and after a long circuitous passage, wherein he experienced the greatest Hardships, a few weeks before it was besieged by D'Estaing, he arrived at Savannah, where he got a small appointment in the Army.⁸

The following spring he attended the Forces to the Siege of Charlestown, and upon its reduction, was enabled once more to return to his Family and Property; but, unhappily, by another Revolt, of the people, he was obliged to quit them at a Moment's Warning, without being able to carry with him the smallest Article of Property, and to take Refuge within the Lincs of Charlestown, and at the final Evacuation of it, to bid an everlasting adieu to that Country.⁹

He afterwards had the additional Misfortune to be taken in the Channel by a French Privateer, and carried with his Family into Dunkirk, a circumstance truly distressing and expensive.

As to his Services, and personal Sufferings in the Cause, they have not he presumes, been inferior to those of many, as is well known to many Gentle-

⁷ Stuart was represented on this occasion by Thomas Phepoe, an Irish lawyer who, although a member of the Whig Assembly from Prince Frederick's Parish, was a loyalist and seemed to specialize in defending other loyalists when they were involved. Stuart stated in an affidavit supporting Phepoe's claim for losses that the latter had defended him when he "was persecuted," without charging a fee. See New York Public Library transcripts of Loyalists' claims, Vol. 53, pp. 5ff.

⁸ He was appointed a chaplain in the Carolina King's Rangers, under the command of Colonel Thomas Brown. This was one of five regiments of loyalists composed chiefly of South Carolinians. See William O. Raymond (comp.), "Roll of Officers of the British American or Loyalist Corps," in New Brunswick Historical Society, *Collections* (St. John, 1894-1930), II (1904), 224-72.

⁹ This was the final evacuation of Charleston, on December 14, 1782, when a great flotilla of seventy vessels carrying nearly ten thousand people—soldiers, men, women, children, and slaves—sailed for the West Indies and for England. See Joseph W. Barnwell, "The Evacuation of Charleston by the British in 1782," in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XI (1910), 1-26.

men; Col. Balfour & Captn. Ardesoif of the Navy, can testify some instances thereof.

As to his Losses, his private Property used to be worth to him about £400 Sterling and his parish £200 per Annum the latter is irrecoverably lost, and also a great part of the Former; and as to the remainder he is totally unacquainted with its Situation having not, since he left America, had the Satisfaction of hearing from those, on whom he depended for its care and preservation, but hopes it is not confiscated, as he was informed, before he left Charlestown, that Mrs. Stuart's Relations, by their Influence, got it erased from the confiscation list.¹⁰

The Income of his Parish arose thus, £760 Currency, i. e. £108 "11 Sterling (the Salary) was paid half Yearly out of the Publick Treasury; the Parsonage House &c he let for £25—and his Fees (it being a very wealthy and extensive Parish) about £80—which to him and in that cheap country and where his Property and Connections lay was better than £400 would be here. This Loss is of public Notoriety, but if it is doubted, the late Ordinary Lt Gov: Bull, or Doctr Fyffe, one of his parishoners can certify it.

His other Losses occasioned by the War cannot be so publicly known but he can conscientiously state the whole thus—

His Parish 7 years..... £1400.

Upwards of 4 years he had nothing from his private property..... £1600.

By near 20 years labour and virtuous conduct he had saved about £2300

Sterling, which he let at Interest; it is now reduced by
their iniquitous depreciation to about £1100

Lost then by Depreciation..... £1200.

But unfortunately about £700 of the £1100 was Lent to Loyalists of considerable property, but whose Estates are now confiscated; whether the confiscators will pay the Debts out of the confiscated Property he knows not; if not the Commissioners will, he hopes, allow it to be a just claim, as it undoubtedly would has [*sic*] been paid but for the part he took.

His Expenses in the West Indies where he had no Support from Government, as those of his Description had here—the consequence

¹⁰ The General Assembly of South Carolina, convening at Jacksonborough, about thirty miles south of Charleston, January 8 to February 26, 1782, passed a confiscation act at the close of the session. In it Stuart is listed as of that group of "Persons Refusing to take an Oath of Allegiance to the State in the Year 17— and in Consequence thereof, by Law obliged to depart the Same—by the aforesaid New Act of Assembly, their Estates now Confiscated, and their Persons Subject to Banishment." Mabel L. Webber (ed.), "Josiah Smith's Diary, 1780-1781," *ibid.*, XXXIV (1933), 198. Very many loyalists so listed had relatives or influential friends among the patriots who, interceding on their behalf, had the sentences of amercement or of confiscation and banishment lightened or entirely lifted. It is probable that Stuart's property was never confiscated.

truly of Loyalty.....	£230.
Expenses and Losses in coming home, and being taken and carried into France	£75.
A Negro Carpenter, Horses &c &c plundered and carried off.	

Your Memorialist therefore prays that his Case may be taken into Consideration, that your Memorialist may be enabled under your Report to receive such Aid and Relief as his Losses and Services may be found to deserve.¹¹

London. March 23, 1784.

¹¹ In support of this claim Lieutenant Governor William Bull made affidavit on February 2, 1787, that Stuart was a staunch loyalist; that he left South Carolina in 1777 "on Account of his Attachment to Great Britain—was drove from Island to Island til 1780 when he repaired to Charles Town which he quitted at the Evacuation—on his return had £60 per annum—is married and has no preferment in the Country." He corroborated the statement of financial losses, but added: "Mrs Stewart [*sic*] has property in South Carolina which is not confiscated and therefore not claimed. She had great Assistance from an Uncle who is since dead." There are also brief supporting affidavits from Colonel James Cassels and Thomas Irving, exiles in London.

Both Stuart and his wife died in England in 1805. Harvey T. Cook, *Rambles in the Pee Dee Basin, South Carolina* (Columbia, 1926), 138.

Book Reviews

Government and Labor in Early America. By Richard B. Morris. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946. Pp. xvi, 557. \$6.75.)

No student of American history can afford to neglect this much-needed systematic study of labor and labor relations of the early period. Professor Morris has brought to this subject a broad conceptual framework and a tremendous body of new material. In the light of his efforts the work of his predecessors seems almost pioneer. The maturity of the study is revealed in his treatment of the mercantilist background of labor relations, the transit of English laws and concepts, their modification in a new economic and social environment, and the differentiation that developed by reason of varying local economies and institutions. New ground is broken also in dealing with the Revolution and the subsequent period; and, finally, the vestigial heritage is accounted for both in terms of what did and what did not survive the early period. To mention that Professor Morris reviewed approximately twenty thousand cases, largely unpublished, hardly does him justice when one keeps in mind that the pattern of government of the era was exceedingly complex. The imperial machinery, the colonial assemblies, the local town and county councils, and the courts, to say nothing of the Continental Congress and the state governments in the later period of his study, were all concerned with labor relations.

Dr. Morris is obliged to limit his study to an analysis of the legal and social position of free and bound labor. Slavery, therefore, is not accorded special treatment since, in his judgment, this subject has been adequately treated in other researches. In his treatment of both free and bound labor, he shows his recognition of regional differences of the highest significance by dealing separately with the New England colonies, the middle colonies, the tobacco provinces, and the rice and sugar colonies. For example, Massachusetts and her neighbors embarked upon a centralized experiment in wage and price controls which were gradually abandoned as the eighteenth century approached, whereas the middle colonies relegated such controls to the local authorities and the southern colonies made only feeble efforts at wage regulation. Again, in dealing with the status of bound labor, the author discusses the marked development of the legal machinery for dealing with the enticement of servants in the middle and southern colonies, as well as the heavier penalties in force against the fugitive and the absentee (except in New York); the stricter penalties for servant misbehavior; and, in general, the harsh treatment of the indentured servant in the tobacco, rice, and sugar colonies.

Free labor, both before and during the Revolution, is discussed in terms of

wages and other conditions of employment. The efforts of workers to combine in an era preceding trade unionism and collective bargaining are accorded full treatment. Maritime occupations were a principal source of labor's income in colonial times; indeed, on the eve of the Revolution 33,000 were so employed. Not only for this reason but also because the roots of labor relations in this field antedate the common law, a searching study was called for. It is a far cry from the laws of Oléron to the American colonies, yet aboard ship the principle of obedience affected the status of the worker and a strike was no mere illegal combination, but a mutiny.

The nature and sources of bound labor are discussed in full. Nearly half of the total white emigration before the Revolution were bound servants. South of New England half of the population was made up of non-English stock of the servant class, though, of course, a higher proportion was English-speaking. The great mass of bound laborers were "free willers." A considerable number, perhaps fifty thousand, were shipped as convict servants. Dr. Morris points out that, contrary to the popular view, the great majority were bona fide criminal offenders, not political prisoners. Maryland received two-fifths of the convicts; Virginia and the West Indies, large groups; New England, very few. The indentured servant class was swollen by the addition of groups bound by the colonies themselves. These included many imprisoned for debt, and for larceny and other crimes. The binding out of indigent children added to the number. Dr. Morris concludes, however, that the number of persons kidnapped and placed in servitude has been greatly exaggerated.

The author is also preoccupied, of course, with the legal status of servitude, and in his discussions of the terms and conditions of employment, the master's quasi-proprietary interest, and the legal and political rights of servants he makes a distinctive contribution to our understanding of government and labor in early America. The decline of the custom of indenture toward the close of the Revolution is of especial interest.

The book is crowded reading even as a research study. The footnotes account for as many words as the text, and include much supplementary material as well as the usual citations. In view of the abundance of evidence assembled by the author, however, there seemed to be no other way of dealing with an obviously perplexing problem. The task of editing and publishing, both of which are exceedingly well done, was possibly as great as the task of writing.

College of William and Mary

JOHN E. POMFRET

Carolina Chronicle: The Papers of Commissary Gideon Johnston, 1707-1716.

Edited by Frank J. Klingberg. *University of California Publications in History*, Volume XXXV. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1946. Pp. x, 186. Calendar. \$2.00.)

This group of documents includes twenty-four items, all except four of them

letters written by Gideon Johnston in connection with his service in South Carolina as the Bishop of London's representative and as a missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts. These letters have been selected from the Johnston papers in the Library of Congress transcripts of the S. P. G. Manuscripts because they seem to be "sufficiently full and continuous to give a complete view of South Carolina in the early years of the eighteenth century" (p. vii). Among those omitted, Professor Klingberg explains, are a dozen letters of minor importance and a larger group of materials dealing with the Yamassee Indian Prince which he promises to edit for separate publication.

Johnston's first letter is dated September 20, 1708, his last, April 21, 1716. He was drowned on April 23, and the final item in the book is Francis Le Jau's report to the Bishop of London on June 7 that "with much difficulty Mr. Commrys corps was brought this day to this town." Some of the letters are quite long, others are mere notes. The majority are substantial letters in the eighteenth century manner, one occupying twenty-seven printed pages and another twenty-five. Professor Klingberg has introduced each letter with an appropriate and discerning statement of its interest and value and has written an extensive introduction to the entire body of papers. A shorter conclusion ties the material together.

For the person who knows nothing else about Johnston except what is here and who is not a student of the period, these explanatory statements are essential to a real understanding of Johnston and his letters. Without them, the letters would seem almost entirely the product of a complaining old English churchman, out of place in a new world and unsympathetic with its people or its problems, constantly in debt and begging for money, always low in mind and body, and full of excuses for not carrying out the work of the Society. Yet Commissary Johnston was not such a man at all. He was only thirty-six when he came to America, and the secretary or bishop who received his letters knew that he was a faithful and devoted churchman, actually in serious physical condition, and beloved of his fellow clergymen; for as they said of him on one occasion, his "unwearied diligence in promoting our welfare in particular, as well as the Advancement of Religion in generall has highly deserv'd our best Affection" (p. 147).

The letters are most importantly occupied with the Commissary's efforts to maintain and strengthen the established church in the face of determined opposition from the South Carolina dissenters, sectaries, and "half-faced" churchmen (the eighteenth-century version of our less elegant modern phrase). They in turn called him "Irish rapparee," "Scotch-Irish Lyllibolaro," and "Schismatick," and they were so powerful that without Johnston's efforts in that confused and difficult period after the passage of the Church Act of 1706 it is doubtful if the establishment could have survived. The editor's analysis of the

problems involved in setting up a church on an English model in a new society is particularly helpful in illuminating these aspects of Johnston's letters.

A large part of the letters concern Johnston's financial difficulties and bodily infirmities. He undoubtedly had malaria and dysentery most of the time, with other troubles added periodically: "My blindness is occasioned by a very great Inflammation and Defluction wch tho' it be but in one of my Eyes yet it so Affects the other that it has rendred it perfectly Useless" (p. 106). "Indeed since the Sickness has abated here I decline Sensibly, and have had Several fits of the Gout or rather Rheumatism, Since my last, Not to say any thing of my loss of Appetite, dejection of Spirit & a body greatly Amaciated" (p. 111).

There are occasional comments on the life of the people, the economy of the colony, and the troubles with the Indians; but the letters are valuable not so much for these comments as for the detail they give on setting up the early church in America, a story which has not been told so fully, as the editor points out, as that of the establishment of civil government and educational institutions.

Vanderbilt University

PHILIP DAVIDSON

Executive Journals of the Council of Colonial Virginia, Volume V, November 1, 1739—May 7, 1754. Edited by Wilmer L. Hall. (Richmond: Virginia State Library, 1945. Pp. xvi, 604. Appendix.)

This publication of the Virginia State Library—the first volume in the series to be issued since the death of Dr. Henry R. McIlwaine in 1934—provides valuable material for the student of the history of Virginia in the eighteenth century. The period of fifteen years covered by the journals was an important one, for it embraced the part played by Virginia in phases of England's conflict with France and Spain, the beginnings of the troubles which culminated in the French and Indian War, the formation of land companies and the appearance of the first large movements to settle west of the Allegheny Mountains, and the development of a definite spirit of self-government. Nothing could be more essential to the scholar than the official actions of Virginia's administrative body on these and other matters, and here are the reports sent periodically to London for the perusal of members of the home government.

The texts of the nine journals printed in this volume are taken from photographic copies of the manuscript originals in the British Public Record Office. They have been correlated in a most meticulous manner with the manuscript executive minute books preserved in Virginia, and footnotes indicate the existence of differences in wording and spelling and even the omission of some phrases in the report forwarded to London. The care with which the editor has performed his task may be shown by one example (p. 8): In the list of supplies provided for the Carthagena expedition in 1740, the minute book for 1738-1743 includes "Water, Candles," while the journal mentions the same

items as "Water Candles." Mr. Hall's footnote calls attention to the fact that there were water candlesticks in the eighteenth century, and then he remarks that the meaning evidently intended was that which would require the comma between the words. Full bibliographical data as to pagination, handwriting, and endorsement are provided for each of the nine journals. An Appendix (pp. 473-500) supplies all available texts of proclamations issued by the governors and the presidents of the Council, some from manuscript copies in the British Record Office and others from photographic copies of *The Virginia Gazette*. The Index (pp. 501-604) is a thorough piece of work—one of the best to appear in any recent archival publication—and is an indispensable part of the volume.

The subjects treated in the journals include hundreds of routine items concerning land grants, appointments of officials, locations of churches and court-houses, and other similar matters. These will help the genealogist and the researcher in local history to place men and tracts in their proper relationships. Among the colorful bits plucked at random from the text are several which throw light on phases of the social history of the times. The removal of the Rev. James Pedin as rector of Nottoway Parish for drunkenness, swearing, and lewd conduct (1742), and the similar removal of the Rev. Thomas Bluett as rector of North Farnham Parish, reflect something of the religious problem in eighteenth-century Virginia. The several permissions to manumit slaves indicate that this action was fairly common well before the Revolution. In the case of Abram Newton, a mulatto who had been purchased by his wife (herself a free woman) and given his freedom before her death, one finds an example of the sort of thing which occurs often. Other items, such as the prohibition of meetings held by itinerant preachers (New Light men, Moravians, Methodists), the refusal to allow "comedians" to act (1752), the compensation given Joshua Fry and Peter Jefferson for their famous map (1751), and the order for a fire engine and four dozen leather fire buckets from London (1754), help to provide a better understanding of the pre-Revolutionary era.

The first large problem faced by the Council in the period covered by this volume was that of the Carthage expedition, and there are details of the efforts to recruit troops and ships, including interesting agreements with the shipmasters hired. The question of convoys for the merchant fleets going to England appears at various times, and one reads about the embargo adopted to prevent supplies from going to Spanish ports and about the measures taken to protect vessels from Spanish privateers. At the same time, one finds the authorities granting relief to Spanish vessels driven to Virginia ports by storms, allowing them to unload cargoes and store them while repairs were made. The protests of ships' officers against the desertion of their seamen to the merchant marine because of higher wages, and the complaints of the same officers against the poor treatment of the seamen by the people of Norfolk, have an almost modern sound.

Indian affairs necessarily occupied a good deal of the Council's time and therefore fill many pages of the journals. There are full texts of letters from the governors of other colonies, and these reflect the ups and downs of the Indian situation. Virginia's own dealings with the Cherokees come in for consideration, with quotations of the speeches made at gatherings, and there is much on the problem of the defense of the frontier against threatened attacks. One sees a steady growth of the sense of co-operation among the colonies, brought about by the necessity for joint action in regard to the Indians. There is a long letter from Governor James Glen of South Carolina (1751), giving an historical account of Indian affairs. George Washington makes his first appearance on the scene as one of four adjutants to direct and train the militia ("besides polishing and improving the meaner people"!). The gradual encroachment of the French in the Ohio Valley, Washington's offer to go to see them, and his report on the expedition occupy the last pages of the volume.

The importance of this publication, and the scholarly manner of its preparation, give reason for gratitude that the series has been resumed. Further volumes will be awaited with eager anticipation.

Maryland Historical Society

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR.

Our Georgia-Florida Frontier: The Okefenokee Swamp, Its History and Cartography. Volume I. By Albert Hazen Wright. (Ithaca, N. Y.: A. H. Wright, 1945. [Pp. xxxii, 223]. Illustrations, maps. \$3.00.)

This volume contains Numbers 9-14 of "a series of avocational studies" in history, all of which relate to the Okefenokee Swamp or its effluents, the Suwannee and St. Marys rivers. Between 1909 and 1922, Dr. Wright was a member of several Cornell University biological expeditions to the Okefenokee Swamp. The more immediate results of these field trips were *A Biological Reconnaissance of the Okefenokee Swamp in Georgia* (1913-1922) and *Life-Histories of the Frogs of Okefenokee Swamp, Georgia* (1932). Now, after nearly a quarter of a century, appear the present papers which, Dr. Wright tells us in his preface, were completed in 1922 "in almost the identical form" in which they are published.

The first three studies comprise an attempt to relate closely to the Okefenokee region the Spanish and French explorations in Florida and Georgia prior to 1565. The fourth is a discussion of the cartography of the swamp, 1750-1850, while the last two are devoted to the Creek and Seminole Indians and the war with those tribes up to 1838.

Dr. Wright's thesis is that the Okefenokee region was the scene of historical events which the preponderance of scholarly authority places in quite different locales. His main contentions are that the Suwannee River and its sources are the Apalache country of Narvaez and De Soto, and that the St. Marys River—

not the St. Johns—is the French River May or Spanish River of San Mateo. "If this be true," he says of the latter identification, "then all the stirring events under Ribault, Laudonniere, Melendez [*sic*] de Aviles and Domino de Gourgues [*sic*] were transpiring in country closely adjoining if not at times in the Okefinokee country" (Pt. III, p. 1).

Undoubtedly, as Dr. Wright remarks, "opinion plays a strong part in mapping the routes of De Narvaez and De Soto" (Pt. I, p. 21). His own opinion, however, on this as on other matters, seems to have been influenced by a sentimental interest in the Okefenokee Swamp. Particularly far-fetched is his argument that Apalache River and St. Marks River of early maps represent the Suwannee rather than the present St. Marks, and that the early San Marcos de Apalache was at the mouth of that river. Dr. Mark F. Boyd's article on the fort in the *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XV (July, 1936), 3-34, shows conclusively that San Marcos de Apalache, from the construction of the first wooden fort about 1680, was always on the point of land at the confluence of the St. Marks and Wakulla rivers. As for Dr. Wright's conclusion that the River May was the St. Marys, he could hardly have adhered to this opinion had he ever read Solis de Meras' account of the exploration of the River of San Mateo by Menendez in 1566. And he should have learned the correct spelling of the name.

Except in the chapters on cartography, the text is largely a series of lengthy quotations. This makes especially unfortunate the typographical errors in which the book abounds. Of a dozen quotations selected at random, only two are accurately transcribed. The arrangement of the book is extremely awkward. Each of the six parts has a separate title page, table of contents, and pagination, and yet the fifteen chapters into which they are divided are numbered consecutively through the volume. There is neither bibliography nor index.

Florida State Library

DOROTHY DODD

Thomas Jefferson, American Tourist. By Edward Dumbauld. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1946. Pp. xv, 266. Illustrations, appendices, bibliography. \$3.00.)

This study is an interesting contribution to the growing body of Jeffersoniana awaiting definitive biographical treatment. Although Thomas Jefferson's travels were limited to the eastern states, to England, and to western Europe, they provoked such a variety of observations as to mark their author a traveler of distinction and of catholic tastes. The secret of Jefferson's success as a tourist is found in what Mr. Dumbauld calls "The Decalogue for Tourists," which forms a part of the travel notes written by Jefferson for two compatriots, Thomas L. Shippen and John Rutledge, Jr. Agriculture, mechanic arts, gardens, architecture, and politics should be the main objects of attention for Americans abroad. Painting and sculpture, both luxuries, were worth seeing, but not studying.

Courts should be regarded as "the Tower of London or menagerie of Versailles with their lions, tigers, hyaenas, and other beasts of prey, standing in the same relation to their fellows." Jefferson had supreme contempt for the brilliant but decadent high society of that day, and more than once he warned younger Americans against its pitfalls. While abroad, especially, he constantly recalled with nostalgia the simple life of his own Monticello.

Jefferson's travels outside Virginia began in 1766, when he went to Philadelphia to be inoculated for smallpox. Nearly ten years later he again came to that city to attend the Continental Congress. As governor of Virginia during the Revolution, Jefferson spent considerable time in Richmond, the new capital of the state. In the summer of 1784 he started on the one extensive journey of his career, which took him to Paris to represent his country at the Court of France. During the five memorable years he remained abroad, he visited various parts of France, England, the Low Countries, Germany, and northern Italy. On his travels he took copious notes, with utilitarian intent; he renewed friendships and formed new ones. Always he was the counsellor and warm friend of visiting compatriots. Despite his advice to younger men to beware of the corruptive influences of society, Jefferson did not isolate himself from it. And although he believed that woman's happiness was to be found in the "tender and tranquil amusements of domestic life," not in the excitement of the social whirl, his associations with Madame de Tott, Countess de Tessé, Madame de Corny, and above all, Maria Cosway, constitute one of the most interesting chapters of his life.

After his return to America in 1789, Jefferson took only one more journey of any length; namely, a pleasure trip through New York and part of New England in company with James Madison. During the still important years of his retirement, Jefferson spent much time at Poplar Grove, where it was possible to find the seclusion he so often desired.

Happily, Mr. Dumbauld usually permits Jefferson to speak for himself, and the latter is never dull. Whether writing about politics, wines, the European peasantry, the Canal of Languedoc, the remains of Roman grandeur, the Provençal language, or the market girls of Newport, his observations are always keen and reveal his own sympathetic nature and predilections. His pen had a strong, sure touch. Madame de Tott was not dispensing empty feminine flattery when she wrote with delight of "les tableaux que vous avez tracés avec un crayon digne de Tenieres, et quelquefois digne de Raphael." The letter to which she was referring is one of the most charming and least known of the numerous ones written by Jefferson to his female correspondents. The deft compliments, whimsical musings, and comments it contains show the author in one of his most genial moods.

In order to complete the picture of Jefferson as tourist, Mr. Dumbauld has carefully listed and described the hostelrys where Jefferson stopped on his

travels and the quarters he occupied during his more lengthy sojourns at Richmond, Philadelphia, Paris, New York, and Washington. Less fortunate is the author's attempt to portray Jefferson as a traveler by stringing together odds and ends of data without sufficient attention to plan and effect. This and other minor faults, such as occasional repetitions, irrelevancies, and misspelling of place names, however, are only minor faults in an otherwise creditable work.

Appendix III contains a chronological itinerary of Jefferson's travels beginning with his attending the Continental Congress. The well-used bibliography is entirely adequate for the scope of the work.

Woman's College, University of North Carolina

ELIZABETH COMETTI

Old Rough and Ready: The Life and Times of Zachary Taylor. By Silas Bent McKinley and Silas Bent. (New York: The Vanguard Press, 1946. Pp. x, 329. Illustrations, appendix, bibliography. \$3.00.)

One of the authors of this volume, Silas Bent, died on July 30, 1945, and the other, Silas Bent McKinley, finished the biography. It would be natural to expect that the story would fall into two rather distinct parts—a first part devoted to Taylor's somewhat long and distinguished military career, and a second part dealing with his brief but conspicuous period as a candidate for the presidency and his sixteen months as President of the United States. The treatment does not follow this plan, some space being given over to bits of party history in almost every chapter. Presumably this policy was adopted in order to furnish readers with a modest background relative to party development prior to 1847.

Tied to such a procedure, the authors were obliged to weave in snatches from the party history of a generation, which called for much more research and study than they succeeded in giving to the political portions of the narrative. A good story of Taylor's military activities is interspersed with brief amateur excursions into political history. The result is that statements relative to difficult political problems are presented with a dispatch and a finality that will be more or less disconcerting to those who have spent years in the study of the sources of party history.

While preparing for the political portions of the biography, the authors should have learned: that the Whig party was not born until 1834 (p. 67); that Henry Clay was not friendly to the "Congressional caucus" in 1823 and 1824 (p. 74); that Webster did not remain in Tyler's cabinet solely because he was negotiating a treaty with Lord Ashburton (p. 114); that William J. Brown was not elected Speaker of the House in December, 1849, nor at any time (p. 252); that a provision to admit Texas as a state could not appear in a bill in 1850, since Texas was annexed and became a state in 1845 (p. 378).

The authors have shown that they were not afraid to challenge accepted views

in regard to General Taylor, and they have not hesitated to state conclusions at variance with traditional conceptions. No doubt most readers will enjoy reading this biography of the rough soldier which portrays some faults as well as virtues. In general, the portrait of Taylor the man is well drawn.

The bibliography lists numerous sources, monographs, special articles, and general works. Relative to Taylor's military career, the authors have gathered much from their sources. In regard to party history, they were not well acquainted with the sources, even of the period from 1847 to 1850. Their knowledge of the campaign and election of 1848, of Taylor's cabinet, and of his relations with Congress while President is rather meager; and they obviously do not understand the crisis of 1850. The part of the biography dealing with the years from 1847 to 1850 is, therefore, naïve and inadequate. If they had made a thorough study of the secondary material listed in the bibliography which relates to these important years, they could have greatly improved this portion of the biography of Zachary Taylor.

Indiana University

WILLIAM O. LYNCH

Robert E. Lee in Texas. By Carl Coke Rister. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1946. Pp. xiii, 183. Map, illustrations, bibliography. \$2.50.)

By portraying a man in whom the heritages of the Lees, the Washingtons, and West Point mingled against a background of isolation, rawness, inconvenience, and deprivation, Carl Coke Rister causes his subject's notable qualities to stand out in bold relief. After many years of efficient, but rather inconspicuous service in the Engineers' Corps of the United States Army, Robert E. Lee had become a captain by the time the Mexican War started. Cited for performances termed brilliant, gallant and meritorious, conspicuously heroic, and skillful in that struggle, he also won General Winfield Scott's "almost idolatrous fancy," and the superintendency of West Point Military Academy. In his two years at the Academy, he improved the discipline, enriched the course of study, planned for the future expansion of the school, and, as he had done in the late war, gained pertinent knowledge of men whom he later commanded or fought in the Civil War.

In March, 1855, Congress created, with other units, the Second Cavalry to patrol the increasingly restless Indian frontier. As lieutenant colonel of that regiment, Lee led it from Louisville to Jefferson Barracks where ague, cholera, and desertion demoralized the troops, and dull court martial duties exasperated their leader. From Missouri Lee was ordered to Texas. He renewed in San Antonio acquaintances he had made in 1846, before going on to Fort Mason and Camp Cooper. In the latter place, a tent post without normal conveniences, eighteen hundred miles from his Virginia home, his body, mind, and soul were conditioned for his later work. With the personnel of such a post, however,—

homespun men, addicted to drinking, gambling, and carousing—the “gentleman soldier,” the “best read man in the army,” the Puritan, and the socially cultivated Lieutenant Colonel had little in common. Between him and the wild Comanche, whose customs and conditions he found “extremely uninteresting,” but whom the government was attempting, he thought unpropitiously, to humanize, there was seemingly an unbridgeable cultural gap. Although he was little interested in watching the government’s efforts to appease the Comanche, he realized that until the experiment was abandoned, border troops had to be constantly on the alert.

Lee must often have wondered what good manners, broad learning, and military skill availed him where purposeless drill, dreary court martial sessions, and fruitless patrol work constituted the daily routine. The author portrays vividly the generally unsuccessful reconnaissances where dust, heat, insects, loneliness, and deprivations were more dreaded than the savage Indians of western Texas, or the elusive Mexican outlaw, Cortinas, along the Rio Grande. In time, however, he found campaigning along lonely trails beyond human habitation fascinating, and he learned to like border life and conditions and the wilderness, if not the cities, of Texas. As temporary commander of his department early in 1860, he performed with patience and ability the routine duties of his office, and in addition took steps to humanize the service.

Lee met with constant frustration during his tour in Texas. He was unable to punish the Comanche or to keep them on the white man’s road, to transform Camp Cooper into a modern post, to capture the slippery Cortinas, or to gain the promotion to which he felt entitled. But he had set an inspiring example of zeal and devotion to duty, and had developed high morale among his troops.

This little volume will add to the already high reputations of the author and of the University of Oklahoma Press.

Mississippi State College for Women

OTTIS CLARK SKIPPER

The Ante-Bellum Charleston Theatre. By W. Stanley Hoole. (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1946. Pp. xx, 230. Illustrations, chronological records. \$3.50.)

This volume is primarily a compilation of contemporary newspaper records of the Charleston stage from 1800 to 1861. It is a veritable storehouse of information from which may be quickly drawn the answer to almost any question concerning the offerings of the Charleston theatre of this period. Except for the seasons of 1813-1814 and 1814-1815, when there were no performances, a chronological record furnishes for each year the names of theatres, managers, scenists, orchestra leaders and other officials, members of the stock companies, stars engaged for limited periods, the roles in which they appeared, and the names of the plays presented. This record is supplemented by three related in-

dices. An alphabetical list of plays shows at a glance when each play was presented. A list of players indicates the years in which each actor or company appeared and makes easily available, from the chronological record, the details of each engagement. Finally, a list of playwrights furnishes the names of the approximately three hundred writers whose plays were on the Charleston boards in 1800-1861.

The more important events and trends in the theatrical history of the period have been summarized in a 64-page narrative which prefaces the records. It is apparent that Charlestonians were deeply interested in plays and players. They "thought theatre, talked theatre, wrote theatre, and went to the theatre." In spite of depressions, fires, religious opposition, the competition of lighter forms of entertainment, and other difficulties, Charleston enjoyed through six decades an almost uninterrupted series of successful, if seldom profitable, seasons. At times a stock company divided the season between Charleston and Savannah, but not infrequently it played continuously in Charleston for six months or more. In the prosperous periods of the late 1830's and the 1850's performances were almost nightly. In 1839-1840, for example, the average was better than five nights per week for twenty-eight consecutive weeks.

Naturally, not all of the offerings of the Charleston theatres were legitimate plays. In fact the people of Charleston seemed at times much more interested in tumbling and other gymnastics, magicians, ventriloquists, balloon ascensions, and circuses than in histrionics. At times the theatre was not much more than a side show under near-by circus management. This was especially true during the interval between the sale of the "Old" Charleston Theatre to the Medical College in 1833 and the building of the "New" Charleston in 1837, a period when the barn-like Queen Street Theatre was very inadequate. At theatrical "low tide" in 1836-1837 no legitimate plays at all were presented. For the ante-bellum period as a whole, however, theatres were managed by actors or local citizens whose chief interest was drama and opera. That a city of such small population should have so well sustained their efforts is a fact which reflects no little credit upon the cultural tastes and standards of the community. Among the playwrights, Shakespeare was a favorite, twenty-three of his plays being produced. *Richard III* was the most frequently presented of all plays (ninety times); *Hamlet* was third, *Macbeth* fifth, and a number of other Shakespearean titles were high on the list of popularity. And increasingly in the later period opera drew full houses.

A notable feature of the Charleston stage was what may be called the "Star system." Resident stock companies, however capable, seldom included the stage celebrities of the period. But beginning as early as 1806 when the English tragedian, Thomas Apthorpe Cooper, was brought to the city for a special engagement by Manager Alexander Placide, many of the most notable actors of the American stage appeared in Charleston. In 1833-1834, for example, Man-

ager Forbes brought to the city "more than ten internationally known artists in the short space of five months." The list included William Charles Macready, Edwin Forrest, Junius B. Booth, and James W. Wallack. In 1846-1847 "there was scarcely a night during the entire season that a visiting player of national prominence did not appear on Forbes's boards. Clara Ellis, J. W. Wallack, Anna Cora Mowatt, Edward L. Davenport, John Collins, John Sloman, Henry Placide, James R. Anderson, Edwin Forrest, Dan Marble, and the Seguins [Opera Company] followed each other in rapid succession." At one time or another Charlestonians also saw Charlotte Cushman, Edward and Charles Kean, Tyrone Power, Julia Dean, Edwin Booth, Mlle. Rachel, and other stage celebrities of the day. And Charleston was included in the 1850 itinerary of Jenny Lind.

The author has made some attempt to relate theatrical developments to the general history of the ante-bellum era. Obviously the "demand for cultural improvement . . . followed in direct ratio the rise and fall of business successes." Less obvious, and indeed highly questionable, is the inference that the prosperity of the 1850's caused the "growth of a defiant independence that was to play a major part in the Secession Movement of 1860." A sounder view would be that prosperity tended to put a damper on secessionist sentiment. As one despairing disunionist put it, "A man will not fight if his belly & pocket are both full and he has to go and look for a row. If we could only have two successive failures of the Cotton Crop I should feel quite cheerful about Southern Rights" (C. K. Prioleau to——, September 27, 1860).

Dr. Hoole has done a scholarly job. The theatrical history of no other southern city has been so completely written as has that of Charleston in this volume and in the earlier work by Eola Willis on the Charleston stage before 1800.

Wofford College

CHARLES E. CAUTHEN

The Famous Case of Myra Clark Gaines. By Nolan B. Harmon, Jr. (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1946. Pp. xi, 481. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.50.)

The United States Supreme Court once stated that "when hereafter some distinguished American lawyer shall retire from his practice to write the history of his country's jurisprudence, this case will be registered by him as the most remarkable in the records of its courts." But the Court was not to be relieved of the Myra Clark Gaines case for more than thirty additional years. By that time the case had been argued at least twelve times before thirty Supreme Court justices over a period of sixty years. Justices Taney, Story, Catron, Wayne, Curtis, Chase, Davis, Field, and Bradley, to mention only a few, had listened to the arguments of such learned counsel as Walter Jones, Francis Scott Key, Reverdy Johnson, Daniel Webster, John Campbell, and Caleb Cushing. The

lower federal courts as well as those of Louisiana had passed repeatedly on this intricate mass of evidence. Not the least interesting fact is that the ten-year job of sifting the records to present the story to the public has been done by a Methodist minister in whose grandfather's house Myra Gaines once boarded.

In 1813 Daniel Clark died, apparently a wealthy man. In his younger days he had made his mark as a merchant and planter, had represented the Territory of Orleans in Congress, had fought Wilkinson, wounded Claiborne in a duel, and had paid court to the beautiful Louisa Catron. Some twenty years after his death, Myra Davis Whitney accidentally discovered that she was only the adopted daughter of a Delaware hero of the War of 1812, Colonel Samuel B. Davis, and that her true father was Daniel Clark. She and her husband instituted court proceedings to clear her name and to recover New Orleans real estate of fabulous value left by Clark. After Whitney's death from yellow fever, her second husband, General Edmund P. Gaines, championed her cause until cholera took him out of the picture. The Civil War robbed her of apparent victory but the court battle was vigorously renewed during Reconstruction and final success came to her estate six years after her death in 1885.

Tons of evidence, twisted muniments, tainted witnesses, forgeries, bribery, ecclesiastical documents, "the mutilated record," "the Latin parchment," "the alimony record," Spanish law, the Louisiana Code, and an excited and prejudiced public opinion, to say nothing of a supposedly lost will, reconstructed from miscellaneous information gathered from depositions of persons long since dead and *probated forty-three years after Clark's burial*, suggest the intricacies and involvements of the case. Was Myra the daughter of Zulime Carrière and Clark? Had they been married? If so, was Zulime a bigamist when she "married" Clark and again when she remarried some years later? Was Myra the *second* daughter of Clark and Zulime? Did Clark leave a will acknowledging Myra as his legitimate daughter? Did his partner, Richard Relf, destroy this will and buy off some of Clark's friends? Why did Zulime, living quietly in New Orleans and evidently a confidante of Myra, never testify in the case? What of Myra's posthumous frustration, when Clark's tomb was opened that she might lie forever beside him and it was discovered that no trace of him remained?

Mr. Harmon does not attempt to answer all of these questions, even though at times it is apparent that he has a weakness for Myra. He simply presents in orderly fashion the evidence which his patient and prodigious research has uncovered. At times he permits his imagination a somewhat restrained play, but he never does violence to his story. He breaks into the middle of his narrative for a complete review of the court testimony, and while this device may appear clumsy to some readers it is necessary for a thorough comprehension of the claims and counterclaims. It would seem that the minister has confounded the legal profession with an exacting and scholarly treatment of this famous old case.

Maverick Town: The Story of Old Tascosa. By John L. McCarty. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1946. Pp. xiii, 277. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.00.)

For over twenty years John McCarty has been writing, collecting, and absorbing the story of Tascosa. His book on the "maverick town" puts his own brand on the history of the Texas high plains as indelibly as the cowboys of the open range marked unbranded dogies to begin their own herds—and as legally. *Maverick Town* is truly McCarty, the result of careful research, awareness of environmental and cultural background, and a love of the Texas Panhandle country. It is in some ways a crystallization in book form of McCarty's work on the golden anniversary edition of the *Amarillo Globe News*, August 14, 1938, a monumental example of an anniversary newspaper.

A virile, active person who dies suddenly while still young is always remembered as young and virile. So is Tascosa remembered—not for the scattered ranch population on the town's old site today nor even for the Boys' Ranch located at the old courthouse, but as a cowboy capital, the rendezvous of Billy the Kid and his ilk, ranch headquarters, the "epitome of all the romance and danger of the early West."

Located at an "easy crossing" on the South Canadian River, midway in its course across the buffalo plains, the Tascosa area was in the region of "Gran Quivira" and the pre-Pueblo Indians. In the eighteenth century it witnessed a culture conflict between the French, Spanish, and Indians. The scene of Comanchero trade and the hunts of the *ciboleros*, the country became the home of *pastores* from New Mexico who built their adobes and plazas along the banks of the Canadian and its tributaries in the 1860's and 1870's. When Charles Goodnight and T. S. Bugbee drove their herds into the free grass country in 1876, a new era and a new conflict opened. Maverick cattle and "human mavericks" who came with them brought the twenty-year boom of the open range, and the Canadian River valley was the heart of the new cattle world. Howard and Rinehart built the first store at Tascosa in 1876. In 1878 Tascosa had a name and a post office. By 1880 it was the county seat of Oldham County, with nine other Panhandle counties attached for judicial purposes.

The chapter on "The Mail Comes to Tascosa" is a finished essay in frontier history with Bob Ingersoll as one of the figures. More familiar figures in the Texas scene are Billy the Kid, Pat Garrett, Charley Siringo, John Chisum, Temple Houston, Jim East, and the ranchmen whose brands covered the landscape and were to become an almost legendary part of the Texas tradition: the LX, the LS, the Jinglebob, the LIT, and the XIT. The cowboy strike was a struggle of the cowboys, the "little men," not to be just "hired men on horseback," but it failed in less than a month. Mavericking and rustling were more serious threats to the big ranchers who organized the Home Rangers and, later,

the Panhandle Cattlemen's Association and stretched the great drift fence of the new barbed wire.

"Life in Tascosa" tells of social activities, frontier justice, and the tribulations of womankind on the plains. One could wish that McCarty had seen fit to devote more space to the most enduring personality of Tascosa—enduring both from the standpoint of longevity and fixity in legend—French McCormick.

Perhaps because he is a newspaper man himself, McCarty's writing is especially effective in his presentation of C. F. Rudolph and his paper, the *Tascosa Pioneer*. The newspaper promoted vigorously the railroads that were to bring ruin to Tascosa by passing it by and developing its rival towns. In the columns of the *Pioneer* the reader watches Tascosa die until tick fever and floods did their work and eventually the county archives moved with officials to a new county seat.

Harold D. Bugbee's chapter-head illustrations and the end-piece maps give feeling and locale to an exceedingly well-written book.

University of Texas

LLERENA FRIEND

American Radicalism, 1865-1901: Essays and Documents. By Chester McArthur Destler. (New London: Connecticut College, 1946. Pp. xii, 276. Illustrations. Cloth \$3.50; paper \$2.50.)

This volume is a valuable collection of papers and documents, most of the papers being reproductions of articles by Professor Destler which have appeared in such periodicals as the *American Historical Review*, the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, the *Pacific Historical Review*, and the *Journal of Political Economy*. As valuable as these contribution are, they do not constitute a well-knit book in any systematic sense, though they show clearly that Professor Destler has such a book in his system. The first chapter is close to such a book in every respect but length. It is entitled "Western Radicalism, 1865-1901: Concepts and Origins," and its thirty-one pages cover the social stirrings of the period, with clear insights and sidelights on the fusion of urban radicalism with coonskin democracy as furnishing the politico-economic background for the latter-day liberals, such as George W. Norris, Thurman Arnold, Harold Ickes, and Henry A. Wallace. The other papers, like the documents, are rather specialized or specific, and they deal with such subjects as "The Origin and Character of the Pendleton Plan," "The Influence of Edward Kellogg upon American Radicalism, 1865-1896," and "The Toledo Natural Gas Pipe-Line Controversy." The paper on Henry D. Lloyd's *Wealth Against Commonwealth* is rather damaging to Allan Nevins' accuracy, consistency, and objectivity as a scholar when it comes to interpreting the career of the elder John D. Rockefeller.

These papers show expressly and by implication that the Turner frontier hypothesis alone is inadequate to explain American radicalism or evolutionary

social democracy. There were also urban influences, with a mixture of native and foreign intellectual origins. It is clearly suggested that much spade work is yet required before we can have the historical synthesis. It might be observed that much more consideration is necessary before we draw sharp lines between agrarian and urban intellectual stirrings. Henry George, for instance, is presented as an example of urban thinking. But, in reality, Henry George utilized the frontier interpretation of American development in his *Progress and Poverty* a dozen years before Turner impressed the historians with that thesis, and it was really the urbanizing process of ending the frontier opportunity for the common man that disturbed the exponent of the single tax remedy. George, like Turner, saw social repercussions arising from the disappearance of the frontier. He was one of the several precursors of Turner.

The papers and documents here assembled furnish good working materials for the large synthesis, whether of frontier agrarianism and urban radicalism or of foreign and indigenous currents of thought. Professor Destler should be nominated as the architect to put these materials together in proper perspective.

Vanderbilt University

H. C. NIXON

The Roots of American Loyalty. By Merle Curti. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1946. Pp. xi, 267. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

With this volume, Professor Curti returns to his studies of particular themes within the broader framework of the history of American thought. It is, as the title suggests, an investigation of the theoretical and practical basis of patriotic loyalty to the nation, in which the author explores the "roots" of patriotism as they may be found in our concept of national history, in local loyalties, in gratitude for economic opportunities, in analogies with scientific hypothesis, as a by-product of fear and hysteria, and in the major crises of war. He examines, likewise, some of the more serious efforts to evaluate patriotism objectively on the part of scholars, humanitarians, internationalists, and radicals. Approximately two-thirds of the volume is devoted to a study of patriotic sentiments prior to 1865—an apportionment of space which will appeal to the historian as logical, but which compels the author to pass rapidly over the significant modifications in the foundations of patriotism since Appomattox.

Professor Curti has relied heavily on quotations from contemporary writers and speakers to develop his story. This is natural inasmuch as any opinion must be the opinion of some person, but it raises the question as to whether any author, however skilled, can reproduce quotations in a ratio approximating the popular strength of conflicting ideas of past generations. And, as in his *Growth of American Thought*, the author has relied generously on the expressions of lesser known men and women, those who may be supposed by their position in

society to be closer to the thoughts and aspirations of the "average" man.

In the evolution of loyalty, as in so many aspects of American life, the Civil War seems to have been a great division point. Prior to 1861 patriotism appears to have rested to a considerable extent on a faith in the destiny of the United States and a conviction that American institutions were, as George Bancroft believed, the product of divine guidance and that the United States was destined to offer for all time an example of superior social and political organization and a refuge for the oppressed of less advanced nations across the seas. Since 1865, this optimism has been dampened by fears of new alien influences, analyzed critically by scholars and by radicals, challenged by a growing sense of internationalism, and to some extent fortified by philosophic concepts which were widely accepted in the period between 1865 and 1910. One may fairly ask whether in the chapters dealing with the earlier period Professor Curti has done much more than put in convenient form information which has been generally accepted as true. His major contributions to an understanding of American patriotism appear to be in the last three chapters, where the new currents of thought are carefully, if not always extensively, analyzed. If any of the major threads upon which loyalty has rested have been slighted, it seems to be the relationship between economic interest and patriotism. This problem is considered thoughtfully, and space probably precluded a more extensive treatment of this phase of the question; but the reader may well feel that here is a subdivision of the subject which is still worthy of book-length study.

Professor Curti is a historian and not a crystal gazer. Properly, he deals with patriotic ideas as they have appeared in the past. But he is none the less keenly sensitive to the forces of 1946. He does not attempt to indicate whether national patriotism as he has traced it is now largely a matter of history or whether we are on the eve of a general broadening to an international scale of our sense of loyalty. He confines any hint of such speculations to a final paragraph, but many readers, in laying down the book, will ask themselves at least two questions. Is national patriotism enough? Can men of good will find equally appealing arguments upon which to base a plea for loyalty to the best interests of all men everywhere?

Claremont Graduate School

HAROLD W. BRADLEY

Historical News and Notices

PERSONAL

The record of new appointments, promotions, and returns from leaves of absence during the present year among members of the historical profession in southern colleges and universities continues to reflect the demands of postwar adjustments. The following notes indicating those changes which have not previously been reported seem to give an impression that very few important history departments in the South have come through the year without some changes in personnel.

At Johns Hopkins University, Kent R. Greenfield, who has been on leave of absence since 1942 for service as director of the Historical Division of the Army Ground Forces, has resigned to accept the position of Chief Historian of the War Department. Mose L. Harvey, formerly of Emory University, and Charles Campbell have been added to the staff as assistant professors of history, and James F. Brewer as instructor. Frederic C. Lane is on leave of absence for the year to serve as historian of the United States Maritime Commission, and Andrew Horn has been given a one-year appointment as assistant professor to carry on his work at Johns Hopkins. Hans Baron, of the Institute for Advanced Study, has been appointed visiting lecturer in history.

At the University of Maryland, Wesley M. Gewehr has resumed his duties as head of the department of history after a year's leave of absence for service in the Army universities at Shrivenham, England, and Biarritz, France. Resignations have been received from Kenneth M. Stamp, who has accepted an appointment as assistant professor of history at the University of California, Berkeley, Richard Hofstadter, to accept a position as assistant professor of history at Columbia University, and Frank B. Freidel to become assistant professor of history at Pennsylvania State College. New appointments in the department include Verne E. Chatelain, formerly of the National Park Service, and Fred W. Wellborn, of Iowa State Teachers College, to the rank of professor of history, Richard H. Bauer, of Mary Washington College, and Horace S. Merrill, of Elmira College, to be associate professors of history, and Beverly McAnear, Herbert Crosman, Donald C. Gordon, and Wilhelmina F. Jashemski as assistant professors of history. Gordon W. Prange has had his leave of absence extended to assume charge of historical research at Tokyo.

At George Washington University, Wood Gray, who recently returned from military leave for service as historical officer in the European Theater of Operations, has been promoted to the rank of professor of history and head of the department. Howard M. Merriman has also returned from military service; and Myron L. Koehnig, formerly of Coe College, has been appointed associate professor of history and dean of the Junior College of the University.

At West Virginia University, Oliver P. Chitwood has retired as professor of history, and Charles H. Ambler has relinquished the headship of the department, but continues his teaching duties. Thomas E. Ennis and Festus P. Summers have been promoted to the rank of professor; Benjamin Keen, formerly of Amherst College, has been appointed associate professor; and Olin D. Lambert and Sara R. Smith have been added to the staff as lecturers in history.

At the University of Kentucky, Clement Eaton, formerly of Lafayette College, has been appointed professor of American history, and J. Merton England of the staff of the history department has been named to serve as editor of the University of Kentucky Press.

At the University of Tennessee, Stanley J. Folmsbee has been promoted to the rank of professor, and Ruth Stephens to associate professor. Mary K. Scarbrough, Ludwig F. Schaefer, Harry Wagner, and Edward H. Gibson have been added as instructors in history.

At Duke University, E. Malcolm Carroll has been granted a leave of absence to do historical work on a special project in the State Department. Bayrd Still has been promoted to the rank of associate professor, and Harold T. Parker to assistant professor. Charles S. Sydnor returns to his duties as professor of history after a year's leave of absence for research under the auspices of a Library of Congress grant-in-aid.

At Emory University, J. Harvey Young and R. Bingham Duncan have been promoted to the rank of associate professor; Francis S. Benjamin, Charles E. Kistler, and John A. Deaver have been added to the staff as instructors in history; and Judson C. Ward, formerly of Birmingham-Southern College and more recently on the instructing staff at the United States Military Academy at West Point, has been appointed associate professor, effective September 1, 1947.

At Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Weymouth T. Jordan has been promoted to the rank of research professor of history, Jack E. Kendrick and O. T. Ivey, who have recently returned from military service, have been promoted to associate professor, and Claude McNorton, George B. Evans, Mrs. F. H. Peters, and Mrs. Albert Chase have been appointed instructors in history.

At the University of Alabama, Clanton W. Williams, who has been on leave of absence since 1942 for service as the director of the Army Air Forces his-

torical program, has resumed his teaching duties with a promotion to the rank of professor. New appointments include Bernard C. Weber and Anne Gary Pannell as assistant professors, and James F. Doster and Vernon C. Grosse as instructors in history. James B. Sellers has been granted a leave of absence for the fall term because of illness.

At the University of Mississippi, James W. Silver has been made head of the department of history. Clare L. Marquette, formerly of Northland College, and Harris G. Warren, of Louisiana State University, have been appointed professors of history, J. Allen Cabaniss has been made assistant professor of history, and temporary appointments have been given to George A. Carbone as acting associate professor, and Robert H. Shields as acting assistant professor.

At Louisiana State University, John P. Moore, formerly of The Citadel, has been appointed associate professor of history, Robert B. Holtman assistant professor, and Philip Uzee and Nancy J. Lucas instructors in history.

At the University of Arkansas, William C. Askew has resigned to accept an appointment at Colgate University. Roman J. Zorn has been promoted to the rank of assistant professor of history, and Vincent Beach, R. Walter Coakley, Robert E. Reeser, Lyle Johnson, and Roscoe Adkins have been added to the department as instructors.

At the University of Missouri, Lewis E. Atherton has been promoted to the rank of professor of history, and David H. Pinkney and William N. Davis have been added to the staff as assistant professors of history.

At the University of Oklahoma, leaves of absence have been granted to Ralph H. Records on account of illness and to Carl C. Rister for the continuation of his study of the development of the oil industry in the mid-continent area. New appointments include William R. Hogan as associate professor of history, Nels M. Bailkey, Garel A. Grunder, John H. Krenkel, and Donnell M. Owings as assistant professors, and H. H. Terry as instructor.

At the University of Texas, Carlos E. Castañeda and H. Bailey Carroll have been promoted to the rank of professor of history, and Holden Furber and Robert C. Cotner have returned from service with the State Department and the Navy, respectively. Leaves of absence for the winter semester have been granted to Barnes F. Lathrop and William Braisted; and Henry Nash Smith has been granted a leave of absence for the year for work at the Huntington Library.

Other appointments which have been reported include the following: Spencer B. King to be professor of history and head of the department at Mercer University; Horace H. Cunningham to be instructor in history at North Carolina State College; Junius E. Dovell to be assistant professor of history at the University of Florida; Charles B. Clark to be professor of history and head of

the department at Washington College, Maryland; Adolph F. Meisen, formerly of the University of Mississippi, to be assistant professor of history at Stanford University; Wesley M. Bagby to be instructor in history at Wake Forest College; John H. Justice to be instructor in history at Appalachian State Teachers College; George Beebe and Albert W. Williams to be instructors in history at the St. Helena Division of William and Mary College; William D. Cotton to be instructor in history at Mars Hill College; Clarence N. Gilbert to be professor of history and dean at Biltmore Junior College; Robert H. Spiro to be professor of history at King College; John C. Matthews of Mercer University to be associate professor at the Savannah Branch of the University of Georgia; Jack Allen to be associate professor at George Peabody College for Teachers; Martha C. Mitchell to be assistant professor at Mississippi College; George M. Brooke, Alvin A. Duckett, William A. Jenks, and Charles W. Turner to be instructors at Washington and Lee University; Rena M. Andrews to be assistant professor at Meredith College; James W. Moffitt to be professor and head of the department at Bessie Tift College; Robert D. Little to be assistant professor and Theresa Waller to be instructor at the University of Chattanooga; Malcolm C. McMillan to be assistant professor at Birmingham-Southern College; and Ottis C. Skipper to be professor and head of the department at Mississippi State College for Women.

Additional promotions which have been announced are: James W. Livingood, of the University of Chattanooga, to be professor of history; Evelyn V. Wiley, of Birmingham-Southern College, to be assistant professor; Frances H. Brandon, of the University of Georgia, to be assistant professor; and Joseph G. Tregle, of Loyola University of the South, to be assistant professor.

Among those who have recently resumed their academic duties following leaves of absence are Gerald M. Capers, Sophie Newcomb College, who has been in the Army; Rhea M. Smith and Udolfo T. Bradley, Rollins College, following service in the Army and the Navy, respectively; Howard K. Beale, University of North Carolina, who has been engaged in research work; Richard E. Yates, Hendrix College, who has been serving as historical officer in the Surgeon General's office; John K. Bettersworth, Mississippi State College, after four years of service in the Navy; and Herbert Weaver, Georgia State Teachers College, who has been with the Historical Division of the Army Air Forces

Christopher Crittenden, for the past eleven years executive head of the North Carolina State Department of Archives and History, has been granted a leave of absence until June 30, 1947, in order to plan and set up a special project of the National Archives, Washington, D. C. Henry H. Eddy has been elected to serve as acting director during his absence.

Jennings B. Sanders, formerly head of the department of history at the Uni-

versity of Tennessee and more recently president of Memphis State College, is serving during the fall term as visiting professor of history at George Peabody College for Teachers. He goes to the University of Washington, Seattle, in January as acting professor of history.

Watt P. Marchman, formerly of Rollins College and librarian of the Florida Historical Society, who has been on leave of absence since 1942 for service in the Army, has accepted an appointment as director of research with the Hayes Memorial Foundation, Fremont, Ohio.

Josiah C. Russell has resigned his position as associate professor of history at the University of North Carolina to become professor of history and chairman of the department at the University of New Mexico.

Alfred J. Hanna and Kathryn Abbey Hanna, of Rollins College, spent the summer working in the archives and libraries of Mexico, Colombia, and Venezuela gathering original materials for their study of the international relationships involved in the French intervention in Mexico. While in South America Mrs. Hanna lectured at the National Library of Colombia under the auspices of the Centro Colombo-Americano and Mr. Hanna lectured before the National Academy of History of Venezuela at Caracas.

Early Lee Fox, professor of history at Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Virginia, was killed in a bus accident on July 24, 1946. He was born at Brown-ton, Virginia, in 1890, and after receiving the A.B. degree at Randolph-Macon College in 1909, he taught in the high school at Accomac, Virginia, before going to Johns Hopkins University for graduate study. He received the M.A. degree in history at Hopkins in 1914 and the Ph.D. in 1917. He was professor of history at West Virginia Wesleyan College from 1917 to 1918, and had held the position at Randolph-Macon College since 1918. In addition to his interest in history, he was active in the work of the Virginia Council on Religious Education, was a member of the advisory committee of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, and served on important committees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. His published works include *The American Colonization Society, 1817-1840*, which appeared in 1919 as a volume in the *Johns Hopkins Studies in Historical and Political Science*, and articles and reviews in historical journals.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia, announces that it is prepared to provide a limited number of Grants-in-Aid of Research in the field of Early American History and Culture to the year 1815. These grants will be available to those who have a definite project of research in progress. Applications must be received by April 15, 1947; announcements

of awards will be made June 1, 1947. Information and forms for application may be procured from the Director of the Institute, Goodwin Building, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Curtis W. Garrison, who has been director of the Hayes Memorial Foundation at Fremont, Ohio, is now Analyst with the Policy Analysis and Records Branch of Civilian Production Administration. The fourth volume of *The United States, 1865-1900: A Survey of Current Literature*, of which he is editor, will come out late this year under the same sponsorship as heretofore. After that, the Hayes Foundation are dropping it from their agenda. Dr. and Mrs. Garrison are developing plans for the continuation of this series under a new sponsorship.

The Texas State Historical Association held its forty-ninth annual meeting in Austin in April with an unusually good attendance. The features of the meeting were an address by Luther H. Evans, Librarian of Congress, on "Texana in the Nation's Capital," and one by Herbert P. Gambrell, of Southern Methodist University, on "Anson Jones and Annexation." Other papers presented during the two-day session included "Texas and Hawaii: Significant Parallels," by Andrew Forest Muir, "Edward M. House and Texas Politics," by Rupert N. Richardson, "Dr. Ernst Kapp, Early Texas Geographer," by Samuel W. Geiser, "Texas Cattle Brands," by Hortense W. Ward, "The Czechs of Texas," by Henry R. Maresh, "Photographs as a Source of Western History," by Carl C. Rister, and "Gail Borden," by Joseph B. Frantz. A special session was devoted to a program for the junior historians in which three papers by high school students were presented. At the annual business meeting of the Association, Dr. Pat Ireland Nixon of San Antonio was elected president to succeed Louis W. Kemp, and Earl Vandale, George A. Hill, Herbert P. Gambrell, and Claude Elliott were elected vice-presidents. H. Bailey Carroll was named to serve as director of the Association succeeding Walter P. Webb, who had submitted his resignation.

The Virginia World War II History Commission has enlarged its staff during the past summer and is now actively at work on its proposed series of publications concerning Virginia and the Second World War. Elizabeth Dabney Coleman (University of Virginia), Newton B. Jones (Emory University), and William M. E. Rachal (University of Virginia) have been appointed to full-time research positions. Herbert C. Bradshaw, superintendent of schools at Emporia, Virginia, and Dean H. L. Price of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute have been appointed on a part-time basis to write booklets on the educational and agricultural histories of Virginia, respectively, during the war years. The Commission's first publication is to be a *Gold Star Honor Roll of Virginians in the Second World War*, which is intended for free distribution. The Com-

mission's office is in the University of Virginia Library at Charlottesville and is under the direction of W. Edwin Hemphill.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Among the recent accessions to the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress the following, arranged in chronological order of materials, may be noted: seventeen documents pertaining to land holdings near Charleston, South Carolina, 1716 to 1863; twelve additional papers of, or relating to, George Washington, 1751 to 1839; letter from Robert Dinwiddie, June 2, 1757; microfilm of papers of William Bond of Massachusetts, 1768 to 1833; microfilm of papers of Benjamin Tallmadge and the Tallmadge family, 1773 to 1846; photostats of lists of Thomas Jefferson's land holdings and slaves, also an index to his account book, 1776 to 1778 (original account book in the Massachusetts Historical Society's Collection; originals of lists and index privately owned); photostat of letter from Robert Morris to Jonathan Hudson, November 30, 1779; one box of papers of Brutus J. Clay, 1782 to 1871; additional papers of John Rodgers, 1785 to 1842; microfilm of nine papers of William Rhodes, trader at Fort Jackson, Pennsylvania, 1785 to 1794, and later; photostat of letter from Pierre Charles L'Enfant to his parents February 13, 1787; eighteen packages of papers of Edmund C. Burnett, pertaining to his study of the Continental Congress; four Civil War diaries, and other papers of Samuel D. Barnes, 1791 to 1867; photostat of family Bible records of Samuel F. B. Morse, 1791 to 1880; two letters from Charles Lee to the President, May 8 and 9, 1796, pertaining to the transfer of the western posts to the United States; microfilm of the diary of Richard Clough Anderson, Jr., July 4, 1803, to July 12, 1826; original diary of Thomas Worthington, September 28, 1805, to June 18, 1807, and photocopy of another diary, May 8, 1820, to January 1, 1821; photostat of letter from John Langdon to the Secretary of the Navy, January 22, 1809; one box of papers of Charles A. Wickliffe and John M. Wyse and related families, 1810 to 1894; five additional papers of Peter Force, 1823 to 1856; photostats of seven letters and two documents of Andrew Jackson [1828] to 1845 (originals in the possession of Mr. Charles C. Hart); letters from John and Josiah Gregg, "To The Commanding Officer of the Escort of Dragoons for the Santa Fe Caravan . . ." May 12, 1839; additional papers of the Breckinridge family, 1853 to 1943; microfilm of the diary of Charles Ross Parke, American physician in Russia, 1855 to 1856; one volume of "Press Notices of William L. Marcy"; papers of John Hancock Douglas, 1861 to 1885, including notes from Ulysses S. Grant, written during Grant's last illness; microfilm of letters from Henry Clay Weaver to Cornelia Wiley, 1861 to 1865; thirty-six letters from George Haven Putnam to Mary Hillard, January 24, 1863, to June 12, 1865; one box of papers of Charles S. Sperry, 1863 to 1885; photostat of letter from Abraham Lincoln to Stephen A. Hurl-

but, November 14, 1864; additional papers of William T. Sherman, 1864 to 1883; letter from Ulysses S. Grant to Samuel H. Roberts, March 12, 1865; one volume of reminiscences of Mrs. Philip Phillips during the Civil War; one large box of papers of Daniel O. Drennan, largely relating to the Civil War; papers of and collected by George H. Stuart, chiefly of the Civil War period; microfilm of scrapbook of Cassius M. Clay, Jr., 1877 to 1912; memorandum of William Boyd, superintendent of sculpture work in the building of the Library of Congress, April 2, [1891], to July 12, 1893; five boxes of papers of Albert Jay Nock, 1911 to 1931; additional papers of Vinnie Ream; type-script copies of records relating to World War I, by Wendell Endicott; nine boxes of papers of James H. Wilson; eight large boxes of papers of, or relating to, William Harrison Polk, including genealogical notes; and four hundred and forty-six packages of papers of William Allen White (restricted). The Library has now acquired full ownership of certain collections hitherto on deposit, particularly the William C. Rives Collection of Rives Family Papers, and the Robert Ogden Collection.

Recent acquisitions of the Archives Department of Tulane University include the following: Benjamin H. Latrobe Papers (1809-1832), relating primarily to the construction of the first water works in New Orleans; list of New Orleans cabarets (1816), giving addresses, names of proprietors, and names of guarantors; and work book (1895-1905) kept at the locks built on Plaquemines Bayou, containing sketches, specifications, and remarks concerning the construction.

The arrangement of the George W. Cable Collection has been completed. These papers contain a number of Cable's manuscripts and significant series of letters, including some from Mark Twain, James M. Barrie, Calvin Coolidge, Andrew Carnegie, A. Conan Doyle, Henry Cabot Lodge, and Edward Bok.

The following collections of books and manuscripts have been received by the Library of West Virginia University in recent months: the Governor A. B. White Papers (1901-1936); seven volumes of *The Millennial Harbinger*, edited by Alexander Campbell, Bethany, Virginia-West Virginia (1830-1870); the Carey Woofter collection of folklore containing approximately 1200 items; several volumes from the Allen T. Caperton library (1852-1860); the Sweet Springs, Virginia, District Court Records (1789-1809); Superior Court Records of Western Virginia (1809-1831); County Court Records of Monroe County, Virginia (1799-1860); and the Monroe County School Records (1818-1863).

Recent additions to the manuscript collection of the Maryland Historical Society include: papers of the Boyce and Mackubin families, 1756-1857, consisting of correspondence, ledgers, notebooks, and sketch books covering both personal and official matters; voluminous correspondence of the Hollyday

family in Talbot and Queen Anne's counties, Maryland, 1677-1905, containing letters dealing with business, land, legal, and personal matters; the farm journal kept during 1824-1844 at "Priestford," Harford County home of the Neilson family; a collection of letters and business papers of General Thomas M. Forman, 1801-1862; letters of Colonel John E. Howard and his wife to their son while he was studying abroad, 1817-1819, which provide important glimpses of social life in Baltimore; business records of the Bloomsbury Mills at Sugar Loaf Mountain, Frederick County, 1806-1842; papers of Colonel I. R. Trimble, dated in April-May, 1861, which comprise a full file of Colonel Trimble's correspondence with the president of the Board of Police Commissioners concerning the troubles in Baltimore at the beginning of the Civil War; a journal of J. F. Hudgens of the Black Eagle Rifles, C.S.A., 1861-1862; an album of the autographs of prisoners at Fort Warren in Boston harbor, 1862; and the correspondence and notes of J. Appleton Wilson concerning the restoration of the senate chamber in the State House at Annapolis, 1894-1906.

The National Archives continues to receive substantial quantities of records of World War II. Among those recently received are the records of the United States Ballot Commission; the records of the Fair Employment Practices Committee, except a few papers being used in liquidating the agency; the Fort Ontario Emergency Refugee Shelter files and other field records of the War Relocation Authority; additional records of the Foreign Broadcast Intelligence Service, consisting chiefly of 11,000 recordings of enemy broadcasts; recordings of Office of War Information broadcasts to Japan, including those made by Navy Captain E. M. Zacharias; records of the New Delhi and Stockholm offices of the Office of Strategic Services; and enemy motion pictures captured in Europe and the Pacific. Of note among other accessions are records of United States delegations at various international conferences, 1923-1938, and scattered pardon records, 1800-1850, which have been missing from the State Department's pardon files and which were found in the custody of another agency.

Recent publications of the National Archives include an essay on *The Appraisal of Current and Recent Records* by G. Philip Bauer, a revised edition of *How to Dispose of Records*, and a brief guide to the holdings of the National Archives, entitled *Your Government's Records in the National Archives*. Copies may be obtained from the Assistant Administrative Secretary of the National Archives.

The Franklin D. Roosevelt Library has recently received from the executors of the Roosevelt estate a number of papers from the late President's naval history collection. Among them are correspondence and other papers relating to Mr. Roosevelt's service as Assistant Secretary of the Navy from 1913 to 1920. A body of miscellaneous manuscripts relating to the history of the Navy, including letters of and other documents concerning prominent Revolutionary

War leaders and Navy secretaries of the period 1775-1865, was also received. Manuscript holdings now available to searchers, in addition to those previously announced, include the correspondence and other papers of Louis McHenry Howe while secretary to Mr. Roosevelt during his Navy Department period; and White House papers relating to education, 1933-1939, the sugar-tariff question, 1933-1939, labor legislation, 1937-1939, and strikes, 1933-1941.

The *Fifteenth Annual Report on Historical Collections, University of Virginia Library*, published by the University, presents a record of the manuscript, microfilm, and other research material added to its archival collections during the year 1944-1945. Each acquisition, whether consisting of several thousand documents or of a single item, is carefully described; and an excellent sixteen-page index enables the searcher for specific information to determine quickly what he may expect to find among this new material. The introductory essay, by Lester J. Cappon, is an interesting and suggestive discussion of the parts played by the individual or family whose papers have been preserved, the private collector, the dealer, and the research library in the pursuit of collecting historical materials.

As Part II (pp. 65-292) of the first volume of its *Annual Report for the Year 1944*, the American Historical Association has published a "Guide to the *American Historical Review*, 1895-1945," compiled and edited by Franklin D. Scott and Elaine Teigler. This is "a subject-classified explanatory bibliography of the articles, notes and suggestions, and documents" appearing in the first fifty volumes of the *Review*. The materials are grouped under thirteen main divisions and almost ninety subdivisions, with subject cross reference sections at the end of each. The arrangement of articles within the section on historiography is chronological by date of publication; arrangement within the other sections is roughly chronological by content, and brief abstracts of the articles are provided to guide readers to those which they wish to consult. An index, arranged by authors, provides the one additional clue needed to locate any given article. The work is well planned and it seems safe to predict that it will quickly come to be recognized as an indispensable bibliographical aid for the serious student of history. It is especially unfortunate, therefore, that through an oversight in the Government Printing Office the orders for extra copies were mislaid and the type was distributed. The only recourse for those historians not on the mailing list for the *Annual Reports* is to ask their congressman or senator for a copy.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Mrs. Greenhow and the Rebel Spy Ring," by Louis A. Sigaud, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).

"William Buckland, Architect of Virginia and Maryland," by Rosamond Randall Beirne, *ibid.*

- "Young Men in Love, 1795 and 1823," by Lucy Leigh Bowie, *ibid.*
- "A Visitation of Western Talbot," by Emerson B. Roberts, *ibid.*
- "Amclung's Old Frederick Glass," by Dieter Cunz, in the *American-German Review* (June).
- "John Dickinson, President of the Delaware State, 1781-1782," continued, by J. H. Powell, in *Delaware History* (July).
- "The Colonial Churches of Northumberland and Lancaster Counties, Virginia," concluded, by George Carrington Mason, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "Colonel William Lamb and Phi Beta Kappa," by Oscar M. Voorhees, *ibid.*
- "The Old Dominion Looks to London; A Study of English Literary Influence upon *The Virginia Gazette* (1736-1766)," by Robert Manson Myers, *ibid.*
- "Commentaries upon the Ancestry of Benjamin Harrison, Part V, Benjamin Harrison of Aldham and Stationer Harrisons," by Francis Burton Harrison, *ibid.*
- "Military Intelligence on Forts and Indians in the Ohio Valley, 1756-1757," by Charles F. Mullett, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (July).
- "The Evolution of Materials for Research in Early American History in the University of Virginia Library," by Lester J. Cappon and Patricia H. Menk, *ibid.*
- "Desertion and Its Punishment in Revolutionary Virginia," by Arthur J. Alexander, *ibid.*
- "Peter Pelham: Organist-Jailer," by Maurer Maurer, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "Removal of the Capital of West Virginia from Charleston to Wheeling, 1875," by Marjorie Holmes Derr, in *West Virginia History* (July).
- "The West Virginia Gubernatorial Election Contest, 1888-1890," continued, by James Henry Jacobs, *ibid.*
- "Stagecoach Days," by Frank Ball, *ibid.*
- "Pardoning North Carolinians," by Jonathan Truman Dorris, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "Richard Caswell's Military and Later Public Services," by C. B. Alexander, *ibid.*
- "Eighteenth Century New Bern: A History of the Town and Craven County, 1700-1800, Part VII, New Bern during the Revolution," by Alonzo Thomas Dill, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Tennessee—Earth Factors in Settlement and Land Use," by J. R. Whitaker, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "The South's First Cotton Factory," by Samuel C. Williams, *ibid.*
- "A History of Zion Community in Maury County, 1806-1860," concluded, by Mary Wagner Highsaw, *ibid.*
- "The Thompson Expedition of 1773," by Robert S. Cotterill, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).

- "The Woman in Lincoln's Life," by Louis A. Warren, *ibid.*
- "Pioneer Linns of Kentucky," continued, by George W. and Helen P. Beattie, *ibid.*
- "President Truman's Ancestors in Kentucky," by Grace Clayton Banta, *ibid.*
- "Farm Machinery in Ante-Bellum Missouri," by George F. Lemmer, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).
- "Some Aspects of the Southern Overland Mail, 1857-1861," by Virginia L. Rebbing, *ibid.*
- "The Story of Jefferson Barracks," by Henry W. Webb, in the *New Mexico Historical Review* (July).
- "Old Navajoe," by Edward Everett Dale, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (Summer).
- "The Nonpartisan League in Oklahoma," by Gilbert C. Fite, *ibid.*
- "The American Indian Exposition in Oklahoma," by Muriel H. Wright, *ibid.*
- "The Educational Activities of Distinguished Catholic Missionaries among the Five Civilized Tribes," by Sister Mary Urban Kehoe, *ibid.*
- "General Benjamin Henry Grierson," by Carolyn Thomas Foreman, *ibid.*
- "The All-Negro Communities of Oklahoma: The Natural History of a Social Movement," by Mozell C. Hill, in the *Journal of Negro History* (July).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Some Reminiscences of Wilm't'n and My Youthful Days—&c.,&c.," by John Hamilton, in *Delaware History* (July).
- "A Note on Capt. John Hamilton," by Charles L. Reese, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Rodney Letters," edited by Leon de Valinger, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," continued, by George H. S. King, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "West Virginians in the American Revolution," edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (July).
- "Additional Mordecai Letters to His Family from Mexico," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "The War Journal of a Confederate Officer," edited by Charles R. Mott, Jr., in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Letters of a College Student to His Sister, 1841-1844," edited by Henry Lee Swint, *ibid.*
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1811," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, *ibid.*
- "A Bibliography of Lexington, Kentucky, Designed to Portray the Changing Historical Scene from 1774-1946," by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).

"The Missouri Reader: The French in the Valley," continued, edited by Dorothy Penn, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"The Creek Trading House—From Colerain to Fort Hawkins," by Ray H. Mattison, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"Politics in Georgia, 1853-54: The Ordeal of Howell Cobb," by Helen Ione Greene, *ibid.*

"Republican Primaries in Georgia," by Lynwood M. Holland, *ibid.*

"The Negro Abraham," by Kenneth W. Porter, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Pioneer Florida: Mexican Squadron at Key West, 1827," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*

"The Port of St. Augustine during the British Regime," continued, by Wilbur H. Siebert, *ibid.*

"Texas and the Oil Industry," by C. A. Warner, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Reminiscences of Sour Lake," by Charlie Jeffries, *ibid.*

"Spindletop," by Boyce House, *ibid.*

"Electra, A Texas Oil Town," by Abby Wheelis Cooper, *ibid.*

"The Annexation of Texas," by Eugene C. Barker, *ibid.*

"Early Times in New Braunfels and Comal County," by Rudolph L. Bieseke, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Charleston in 1774 as Described by an English Traveler," contributed by John Bennett, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"A Provisional Guide to Manuscripts in the South Carolina Historical Society," continued, by Helen G. McCormack, *ibid.*

"Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," contributed by Elizabeth Heywood Jervey, *ibid.*

"Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*

"Memoirs of Frederick Adolphus Porcher," continued, edited by Samuel Gailard Stoney, *ibid.*

"Marriage and Death Notices from the Pendleton Messenger of Pendleton, S. C.," continued, contributed by J. M. Lesesne, *ibid.*

"John Ashmead and Some of his Descendants in Pennsylvania and South Carolina," compiled by Mary Pringle Fenhagen, *ibid.*

"The Kollock Letters, 1799-1850," edited by Edith Duncan Johnston, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"Notes on the 'Catalogo de los Fondos de las Floridas,' " by Albert C. Manucy, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (July).

"Texas vs. Louisiana, 1849," edited by Barnes F. Lathrop, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

"American Garden Books, Transplanted and Native, before 1807," by Sarah Pattee Stetson, in the *William and Mary Quarterly* (July).

"The Agrarian Democracy of Thomas Jefferson," by A. Whitney Griswold, in the *American Political Science Review* (August).

"The Civil War Diary of John T. Buegel, Union Soldier," continued, translated by William G. Bek, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).

"Major-General Patrick R. Cleburne, C. S. A.," by William M. Sweeny, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"The Archive Office of the War Department: Repository of Captured Confederate Archives, 1865-1881," by Dallas D. Irvine, in *Military Affairs* (Spring).

"Theodore Roosevelt and the South in 1912," by Arthur S. Link, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).

"Southern Agricultural Economy in the Postwar Era," by G. W. Forster, in the *Southern Economic Journal* (July).

"Regional Aspects of the Problem of Full Employment at Fair Wages," by John V. Van Sickle, *ibid.*

CONTRIBUTORS

T. HARRY WILLIAMS is associate professor of history at Louisiana State University.

CHASE C. MOONEY is assistant professor of history at Indiana University.

CHARLES W. TURNER is an instructor in history at Washington and Lee University.

LEWIS E. ATHERTON is professor of history and chairman of the department at the University of Missouri.

WILLIAM D. HOYT, JR. is assistant director of the Maryland Historical Society.

HENRY D. BULL is a clergyman of the Episcopal Church, living in Georgetown, South Carolina.



Alexander H. Stephens

by Rudolph Von Abele

An authoritative biography which offers a fresh interpretation of Stephens and his times, an unbiased story of events leading up to and following the Civil War, and a fascinating study in the psychology of leadership.

1946; xiii, 357, x pages; \$4.00 net.

Forthcoming

The Making of a Southerner

by Katharine Du Pre Lumpkin

An engrossing account of one person's growth in the midst of conflicting social forces. More than the autobiography of an intelligent and sensitive woman, here is a study affording the reader a remarkable insight into the things that make the South what it is—the ideas, sentiments, manners, prejudices, ways of life.

January, app. 300 pages, \$3.00 net.

The South Old and New: 1820–1947

by Francis B. Simkins

A pioneer work in relating the history of the Old and New South since the beginnings of sectional consciousness in 1820, and breaking new ground in providing a comprehensive and interesting account of the development of the South since 1865. Literary, educational, artistic, social, and religious themes, as well as economic and political materials, are dealt with.

Spring, more than 700 pages.

**The College Department
ALFRED A. KNOPF, Inc.**

**501 Madison Avenue
New York 22**



The Pacific Historical Review

Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the

American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Book Review Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

DAN E. CLARK

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

WILLIAM H. ELLISON

FRANCIS H. HERRICK

MERRILL M. JENSEN

W. KAYE LAMB

MAX SAVELLE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;

Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

The William and Mary Quarterly

A journal designed to promote interest in the history
of Colonial America and of the formative
era of the Republic.

The William and Mary Quarterly is published by
The Institute of Early American History and Culture.

(Sponsored by The College of William and Mary,
and Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.)

Board of Editors

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY

RANDOLPH G. ADAMS

CARL BRIDENBAUGH

DOUGLAS SOUTHAL FREEMAN

SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON

STANLEY PARGELLIS

Managing Editor, RICHARD L. MORTON

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES: \$1.00

Correspondence should be addressed to

The Managing Editor, Goodwin Building, Williamsburg, Virginia

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the
United States containing articles, inedited documents,
book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.*

MANAGING EDITOR: JAMES FERGUSON KING

BOARD OF EDITORS

Arthur S. Alton
Carlos E. Castañeda
Charles C. Griffin
Lewis Hanke
Roscoe R. Hill

Roland D. Hussey
James F. King
Irving A. Leonard
Alexander Marchant

ADVISORY EDITORS

Herbert E. Bolton
Isaac J. Cox
Clarence H. Haring

Dana G. Munro
J. Fred Rippy
William S. Robertson

Editorial correspondence: PROFESSOR JAMES F. KING
ROOM 439, BANCROFT LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY 4, CALIFORNIA

Business correspondence: DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLLEGE STATION
DURHAM, N. C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831 — Chartered 1834

ALEXANDER W. WEDDELL, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The July, 1946, issue contains the following:

The Old Dominion Looks to London, by Robert Manson Myers.

Colonel William Lamb and Phi Beta Kappa, by Oscar M. Voorhees.

The Colonial Churches of Northumberland and Lancaster Counties,
concluded, by George Carrington Mason.

Commentaries Upon the Ancestry of Benjamin Harrison, continued, by
Francis Burton Harrison

Book Reviews

Genealogies

Notes

MEMBERSHIPS: Life, \$100.00; Annual Sustaining, \$50.00;
Annual Supporting, \$25.00; Annual, \$5.00

Magazine sent without additional charge to members

The Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.
RICHMOND 19, VIRGINIA

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y.
CLAYTON TORRENCE



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

PRESIDENT

ELLA LONN, Goucher College

VICE-PRESIDENT

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

J. G. DE ROUHLAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Tulane University (1947)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1948)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

LYNN M. CASE, University of Pennsylvania

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)

J. WINSTON COLEMAN, JR., Lexington, Kentucky (1947)

HENRY T. SHANKS, Birmingham-Southern College (1947)

J. HAROLD EASTERBY, College of Charleston (1948)

DANIEL M. ROBISON, Vanderbilt University (1948)